The Commoner

CONDENSED

William J. Bryan

238 Paris
419 Harvard

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/commoner0007will

MRS. HELEN WATTS-MCVEY

EDITOR HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE COMMONER

The Commoner

Condensed

BY

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

VOLUME VII.

Published by
THE HENNEBERRY COMPANY
Chicago
1908

INDEX BY TITLES

	Page.
Business Honor	1
Campaign Contributions	2
Destiny	3
Ignorance	4
The Moral Awakening	4
One More "Defender"	14
The Starch Trust	15
Think of This	16
He Kept the Faith	16
The International Marriage	17
The Asset Currency Bill Scheme	17
Along the Pacific Coast	22
Rate Legislation Necessary	27
Interlocking Corporations	28
Society's Ban	28
John A. Creighton—Philanthropist	29
The Direct Primary	29
Nebraska and the Ship Subsidy	30
No Tariff Revision	30
From Jackson to Roosevelt	33
A Remarkable Editorial	34
Gratifying	34
Going Democratic	34
Mr. Bryan's Address before the Washington Legislature	35
"If Unchecked and Unpunished"	52
John P. Altgeld	52
The Weekly Newspaper	53
Railroad Management	55
Philippine Independence	57
Panic	58
Clinton Babbitt	59
Monarchy Suggested	60
State vs. Nation	61
As Clear as—Mud	62
Russian Reform	63
Real Infidelity	64
Things "Ultimate" and Things "Immediate"	65
"Ultimate Ownership"	66
What They Want	68
General Lee's Example	69
Saving His Face	70
The Demands of Labor	71
"Cornfield Lawyers"	73
Government Regulation	74
Mysteries	78
At the Grave of Gov. Hogg	79
The Steal in Steel	81

Page.
Publicity 82
The Southern Candidate 82
James on Asset Currency 85
A Champion of Plutocracy 85
Money Above Duty 88
Statesman or Financier, Which? 90
Russian Reform 93
Aldrich Bill "Joker" 93
A Doubtful Endorsement 95
A Model Constitution 95
Why Not La Follette? 96
That Five Million Fund 97
The "Conservative" South 98
President Defends Subsidy 102
Andrew Carnegie's Magic Lamp 104
"Humiliated" 105
Mr. Bryan to the Wall Street Journal 105
Cleveland on Insurance 111
Clear on One Point, Anyway 113
Missed La Follette 113
Mr. Hearst's New Party 113
The Constitution Supreme 115
Where Does Mr. Taft Stand? 116
"Life Term" 117
Centralization 118
In a Bad Way 119
Think of This 120
Frightened Again 120
The Democratic Position 122
Governor Woodruff 125
A Diagram 126
Undesirable Citizens 127
Mr. Bryan in New England 128
In 1896 and Today 128
The Governor's Speech 130
Mr. Bryan's Sermon 131
Lincoln's Democratic Mayor 132
Republican Advice 133
The Independence League 135
Is This Calamity? 137
Good for the President 139
Easily Answered 140
"Let the People Rule" 143
The Railroad in Politics 156
Opposing Oklahoma Statehood 159
Advertising Confidence Games 161
"Greeks Bearing Gifts" 163
Futures 164
Death Claims Two Friends 165
The Valuation of Railroads 169
Municipal Initiative and Referendum 170
A Question of Authorship 171
Wars 172
Fake News from Lincoln 173
Strange Advisors 174
Taft Must Speak 175

Page.
Licensing Interstate Corporations 176
Watch the Frontier 177
The Jamestown Exposition 178
"No Taxation Without Representation" 179
The Irish Bill 195
"Trusting" the People 196
The Oklahoma Constitution 196
"Before Richmond" 199
John T. Morgan 201
That Tariff Commission 201
What About Missouri? 202
Threatening Panic 203
Goodbye to the Chronicle..... 204
By the Masses, of Course 205
Planning for War 205
Governor Hughes' Veto 206
What is a Democrat? 207
A Word on Speculation 213
The Tariff 216
What Will it Stand For? 218
The Japanese Question 219
Mr. Bryan on Campaign Contributions 220
Popular Government Spreads 226
Government Ownership Not an Issue 226
Another Orator 228
The Democratic Outlook 229
A Railroad View 232
Winning by Justice 233
Far-reaching Corporate Influence 234
Not a Matter of Ambition 235
Lawson's Remedy 235
Evading the Law 237
The Jingoes at Work 237
Faith 238
Railroad Magnates Pleased 245
Reduce the Interstate Rate 246
Indestructible 247
Steel Mail Cars 248
After the Election 248
Jackson on Money 249
Surplus 250
No Danger of Panic 251
Do They Favor Regulation? 251
A Work of Art 254
Good for Landis 255
The Haywood Trial 256
Praising Roosevelt 257
A Billion Dollar Asset 259
Tariff Catechism 260
Always "Manana" 264
Immune 264
Help Oklahoma 265
Raising a False Issue 265
Sherman Anti-Trust Law Not Amended 267
The Greatest Man 268
The Tariff in 1896 and 1900..... 268

Page.
Ultimately 270
President Urges Centralization 270
Taft Weakens on Reform 272
So Democrats Charged 273
Taft on Government Ownership 274
Trusting the Individual 276
"Manana" 277
Misrepresenting Municipal Ownership 277
The Lineup 278
The Turn in the Lane 278
Prove it Now 279
Silent on the Tariff 281
In Oklahoma 282
Mr. Bryan in Oklahoma 283
Locating the Blame 298
The Oklahoma Victory 301
Welcome, Oklahoma 303
"Back to the People" 303
Virginia vs. Pennsylvania 304
Why Not to Others? 307
Defending the States 309
How Will They Explain? 311
Why Not Submit it to the People? 311
The Hague Court 312
Why "Exceedingly Desirable" 313
A Shocking Story 314
Let the Foreigner Pay It 316
The Nebraska Platform 316
A Word to Democrats 317
Why La Follette? 322
Johnson and Burton 324
The Trustee 324
After Asset Currency Again 326
Straws 327
An Object Lesson 329
A Virginia Hint 330
Another Straw Man 330
Earning the Title 337
Republican Campaign Funds 338
A Good Example 339
The Asset Currency Scheme 340
Mr. Bryan's Position 342
Tom Johnson Triumphant 346
Pushing Asset Currency 347
Protecting Depositors 348
Be Patient, Depositors 351
Abolish the Stock Exchange Ticker 367
Mr. Bryan at the National Capital 368
The President's Message 375
Guaranteed Deposits 381
Campaign Contributions 383
The Bennett Fountain 385
Mr. Bryan's Speech 387
Regulation Will Be Easier 392
Campaign Expenses 392
Pecuniary 393

Page.
Christmas 393
Prominent Mention 394
Why Not Test Them? 394
Minority Leaders Chosen 400
The President Reiterates Declination 401
Secretary Taft's Mother 403
The Kaiser's Policy 403
Opening the Campaign 404
Kentucky 405
The Views of a Veteran 407
No Central Bank 407
Circulate Petitions 408
The Currency Question 409
Now Watch for Trust Amendments 413
Oklahoma—Pioneer 414
Nebraska in Evidence 415
A Few Straws 416
A Word to State Bankers 417
The Country Newspaper 418
The Wise Age 419

The Commoner Condensed

BUSINESS HONOR

Professor Jenks, in calling attention to business honor as now defined, said in a recent speech: "The frequency of great fortunes, gathered perhaps legally but in ways felt to be unjust, through the power of monopoly, have tended strongly to obscure the moral vision of many well meaning men, who have been thereby led to confound morality with social righteousness; and their acts have formed the excuse for many others to break laws, which seem to them unjust. The profit from an unjust, though legal, stock watering may well prove more demoralizing in business circles than the illegal freight rebate which saves from ruin a grain shipper caught at a disadvantage."

A large volume could be written on this subject and many interesting instances could be given to illustrate modern business honor. Professor Jenks calls attention to the monopoly. Men who would blush to be called highwaymen, will rob through monopoly and defend it although their crime is grand larceny as compared with the petty stealings of the highwaymen. Men who break laws with impunity when those laws stand in the way of their grasping methods, will pose as friends of law and order when some small crime is committed. We have recently seen a man prominent in the financial world escape from the charge of embezzlement on the ground that he had no personal interest in diverting insurance funds from the pockets of the policyholders to the treasury of the republican campaign committee, and now we see that same financier, Mr. Perkins, indicted along with an ex-secretary of the treasury, Mr. Fairchild, for forgery, and their excuse is that they derived no pecuniary profit

from their violation of the law. They simply did it to deceive the authorities of a foreign nation in which their company did business. Is it not time for our preachers, our publicists and our moralists to so define crime as to take away from these business men the excuse that they sin ignorantly? Is it not time that the public conscience was turned upon these questions? The business men themselves ought to see to it that their class is relieved from the odium that attaches to these constant violations of statute and moral law. The old story of the man who, upon seeing on a tombstone the inscription: "Here lies a lawyer and an honest man," expressed surprise that so narrow a grave could hold two persons, will soon be applied to the business man if a reform is not instituted.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

In the discussion of laws respecting campaign contributions, one point is often overlooked, namely, that the publication of receipts and expenditures should precede, not follow, the election. The efforts thus far made to secure publicity have been largely nullified by the fact that the publication comes too late. The facts brought out after the election, not being connected with the next campaign, are of little service in that campaign. The fear of a post-election publication will, of course, deter some from corrupt contributions, but a publication before election would still more powerfully deter. Take the late New York election for instance. During the campaign republican papers asserted that Mr. Hearst was using a large sum of money to advance his personal ambition. His expenditures were magnified, and he was accused of attempting to buy the governorship. When the election was over and the statements filed by the committees, it was found that the republican committee spent more than Mr. Hearst's committee, and it was also found that several of the trust magnates in New York were down on the republican list for large amounts. J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., contributed $20,000; Levi P. Morton & Co., $20,000; Andrew Carnegie gave $5,000; the younger

Rockefeller gave $5,000; Charles Schwab gave $5,000; Mr. Mackey of the Postal Telegraph gave $2,000; Mr. Depew of the New York Central gave $2,500; Mr. Gates of the Steel Trust gave $2,500; Kuhn, Loeb & Co., $2,000; Jacob Schiff, $2,000; Wells of the Adams Express Company, $5,000. The Copper Trust and the Coal Trust also contributed through their representatives. If these contributions had been known before the election, the public could have seen more clearly on which side predatory wealth had arrayed itself.

The democrats in congress and in various states ought to see to it that the laws passed upon this subject require the publication of contributions several days prior to the election. Three publications might be made, one a month before the election, one fifteen days before the election, and one five days before the election, and no contribution should be accepted after the last publication. The public has a right to know not only who contributes and how much but the information ought to be given before the people vote. Nothing will so tend to prevent the employment of a large corruption fund as the publication of the fund before the election, for the party that relies upon the trusts to finance its campaign will find that the support of the trust magnates will do the party more harm than the contributions will do it good. Let the facts be known before the election.

DESTINY

Whenever a statesman is unable to defend a thing which he wants to have done, he usually hides behind the plea that it is destiny. That the readers of The Commoner may be able to answer this destiny argument the following quotation is given from the "Last of the Barons" by Bulwer. William of Hastings is described as laying his sins at the door of destiny, and the author makes this comment: "It is destiny!—phrase of the weak human heart! It is destiny! Dark apology for every error! The strong and virtuous admit no destiny! On earth guides conscience—in heaven, watches God. And

destiny is but the phantom we invoke to silence the one, to dethrone the other!"

Each man's destiny is in his own hands so far as his moral progress is concerned. If a man is going to be a thief, circumstances may determine whether it is his destiny to escape punishment or to be caught, but the man decides for himself the all important question whether he will be a thief. And so circumstances may determine how much profit or how little profit a country can find in a policy of imperialism, but the country itself must decide—the people or those whom the people permit to speak for them—what the policy of the country will be. Destiny is indeed the dark apology for many national errors.

IGNORANCE

President Ripley of the Santa Fe Railroad company testified before the interstate commerce commission: "I did not know, until I read it in the newspapers, that Mr. Harriman owned stock in the Santa Fe." Yet it developed that Mr. Harriman controls $10,000,000 in Santa Fe stock.

Is it necessary that the president of a railroad be informed on the affairs entrusted to him? Or are we to have railroad presidents who don't preside—like bank and other corporation directors who don't direct? The result of such negligence is, in the case of railroads, wrecked trains and jobbing in railroad stocks; in the case of banks, misappropriated funds; and in the case of other corporations manipulation of the company affairs not only to the detriment of public interests, but to the detriment of many of those directly interested in the company itself.

THE MORAL AWAKENING

Eleven years ago Tolstoy quoted a letter that had been written by Dumas two years earlier, in which the great Frenchman, with rare prescience, said: "The spiritual

movement one recognizes on all sides, and which so many naive and ambitious men expect to be able to direct, will be absolutely humanitarian. Mankind, which does nothing moderately, is about to be seized with a frenzy, a madness, of love. This will not, of course, happen smoothly or all at once; it will involve misunderstandings—even sanguinary ones, perchance—so trained and so accustomed have we been to hatred, even by those, sometimes, whose mission it was to teach us to love one another. But it is evident that this great law of brotherhood must be accomplished some day, and I am convinced that the time is commencing when our desire for its accomplishment will become irresistible."

Thus it will be seen that a great philosopher in Russia and a French writer of note discerned more than a decade ago the signs of a new era. In another part of the letter Dumas said: "I know not if it be because I shall soon leave this earth, and the rays that are already reaching me from below the horizon have disturbed my sight, but I believe that our world is about to realize the words, Love One Another."

What these men saw with the eye of faith is becoming more and more evident, and nowhere is this change more noticeable than in the United States. That ethical questions are receiving increasing attention is certain. If the awakening were confined to this country we might look for a cause in local conditions, but these conditions do not apply to Russia, and Tolstoy has not been out of his native land for years. How can we explain his indorsement of Dumas' statement? And what was there in Dumas' environment to impress him with the coming of this brighter epoch? It must be more than a national movement.

While the stirring of conscience is manifesting itself within the churches, it is outside the scope of this article to discuss the evidences of it. The Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Christian Endeavor Society, the Epworth League and the brotherhoods and societies of the various denominations and branches of the Christian church—all these are at work enlisting the young men and young women and encouraging the application of Christ's teaching to everyday life.

But the movement seems to have a broader foundation than any nation or race. It extends around the globe; it reaches down and takes hold upon the heart—the connecting link which binds every man to every other man. No movement can be a universal one unless it appeals to the heart, and nothing that really appeals to the heart can be less than universal in its scope and influence.

The brotherhood of man is the slogan of the new movement, and a powerful slogan it is.

The first effect of the moral awakening is on the individual himself—an examination of self, a scrutiny of ideals, an analysis of motives and ambition. For a generation the American people have been money-mad, and life has been measured by accumulations. The poor have imitated the rich, and the rich have made new records of extravagance. Plutocracy in America, lacking even the insufficient restraints imposed by pride of pedigree, has run riot, and the excesses of the purse-proud, instead of exciting contempt, have only awakened a spirit of emulation.

But the crisis is past. From the press, the pulpit, the college, the Chautauqua platform and the home, is coming a healthy protest against the measuring of life by a pecuniary standard. The change in the ideal means a revolution in the life, whether the change takes place in the individual or in the group. An increasing number of our people realize that there is a higher end in life than the making of money—that money is only a means to an end. They also realize that money, while a good servant, is a heartless master. The popularity of Charles Wagner's book, "The Simple Life," is due to the fact that it is a vigorous indictment of present conditions, wherein man has been made subservient to his material possessions. The author's plea for a reversal of the order and for the placing of man above matter, finds a quick response in a multitude of hearts. The translation of this little volume into many languages shows how widespread is the weariness with materialism and how eagerly the new thought is grasped, while the fact that the book sold best in the United States is evidence that here the movement is already strongest. But this new bit of evidence

was not necessary to convince any unbiased mind that our country leads the world in disinterested effort.

The substitution of a new ideal of life for the old one is manifesting itself in several ways. In the individual, it introduces justice into the methods of accumulation and altruism into the distribution of money, and, of the two, the first is the more important. It is better to gather honestly than to distribute generously. Sometimes distributions have silenced tongues that otherwise would have spoken out against the methods employed in accumulation. Trust magnates, for instance (whether they intended to or not), have subsidized colleges, charities and even religious societies into a defense of business methods which violate all moral and statute law.

ENLARGING THE SYMPATHIES

Assuming that the means employed in acquiring a fortune are legitimate, much depends upon the spirit and purpose with which it is used. It is as selfish for a man of means to spend all of his fortune upon his family as it is to spend it upon himself, for the family is only a larger self. The country was shocked when Marshall Field ignored the claims of society and tied his tremendous estate up in a trust for the benefit of his family. That one could live in a world like ours, amid the appeals from worthy societies engaged in works of humanity, charity, education and religion, and still be deaf to the cries for aid and blind to the needs of the suffering and neglected, shows how small a heart this successful business man had.

There can be no moral awakening that does not enlarge one's sympathies and create a sense of stewardship, however fairly one's wealth has been secured; but an examination into the methods employed in making money is of still greater moment. One can not atone for wrong done to a multitude by giving to a few, even though the few may be very deserving; and, moreover, one who does wrong to the masses is not likely to be conscientious in the use of his money. The employment of immoral methods in business so perverts the mind and corrupts the heart that one takes a distorted view of the relations of life. We have seen abundant evidence of this in the conduct and utterances of the nation's exploiters. No insti-

tution is too sacred for them to defile—government, the home and the church have alike suffered at their hands.

Aside from inheritance, the only honest method of accumulation is by rendering to society a service equal in value to the compensation drawn from society. The word honest has too often been used to describe every transaction that was not punishable as a crime, but it can not properly be used to describe any transaction which is one-sided. Reciprocal advantage—an exchange of equal values—this must be assumed if business is to stand a moral test. The application of such a test by the individual would in itself go far toward the establishment of business upon a sound basis. Almost all, if not all, injustice can be traced to the effort of one individual to take advantage of another. Doubtless this attempt has often been made thoughtlessly—that is, by the employment of customary methods without stopping to examine into them. It is probably true that a large proportion of the wrong now done through illegitimate business methods is done without deliberate intention to wrong. When a Chicago banker was exposed in wrongdoing recently, a government official threw the mantle of charity over him and said that he only did what others were in the habit of doing. But this excuse will not stand at the bar of conscience. No collusion between wrongdoers, no long-standing custom can change the moral character of a transaction, and when the searching process begins no one will delude himself with the argument that others also are guilty.

SPOILS DIVIDED ARE STILL SPOILS

The manufacturer occupies a dual position. He sustains a relation to those who work for him and to those why buy from him. If he is entirely selfish he may do injustice to both classes, or he may advance his interests by conspiring with one class against the other. Some of the trusts have sought to form an alliance with their employes against the public and have gone so far as to promise a division of the spoils. Such a contract would be indefensible in morals even if it were enforceable by law.

The moral quality of an act is not determined by the

character of the beneficiaries. A private monopoly might be less objectionable if all the pecuniary advantages secured by it were fairly divided among those who work for it, but to say that a private monopoly is necessarily good because the wage-earners in its employ reap all the benefit is equivalent to saying that the laborer can do no wrong. While, as a rule, the wealth producers receive too small a share of the products of their toil, the remedy is not to be found in allowing them to increase their share by a conspiracy with the trust magnates—for, in doing so, they would be trespassing upon the rights of other wealth producers as well as upon the rights of the general public—but in legislation which will eliminate the principle of private monopoly and protect all alike. But, ignoring, for the sake of argument, the moral element involved, the wage-earner can not afford, as a matter of policy, to assist the trust magnates in cornering the market, for the same greed which leads the owner of a monopoly to overreach the consumer will lead him to overreach the laborer also whenever circumstances will permit. In fact, an arbitrary increase in price tends to lessen consumption, and that in itself reduces the demand for labor.

The employer, while guaranteeing to his employes a wage which will be just as between him and them, must guarantee to the public a price which will be just as between the public and him. The organizer of an industry —the executive who plans the work, purchases the material and assigns the tasks—is necessarily a factor in production and as such is entitled to compensation out of the product. The trouble has been that the "captains of industry," fixing their own compensation, have been too generous with themselves and have appropriated to their own use a part of labor's share, while they have at the same time extorted from the public a compensation out of proportion to the service rendered to society. This fact was admitted by President Harrison in his letter of acceptance in the campaign of 1892, when, referring to the Homestead strike, he used these pathetic words: "I regret that all employers of labor are not just and considerate, and that capital sometimes takes too large a share of the profits."

CONSCIENCE THE POTENT RESTRAINT

While legislation should, as far as possible, protect each citizen from injustice at the hands of every other citizen, there is a wide zone between the duties which the law can enforce and the wrongs which the law can prevent—a zone in which conscience, and conscience only, controls. It is in this zone that the larger part of life is spent and the larger part of life's work is done. For every person who is honest because of the law a hundred are honest because of conscience; for every person kept in the path of rectitude by fear of the penitentiary many hundreds are made righteous by the promptings of the conscience.

The ethical awakening upon which our nation is entering will not expend its whole force in turning individuals away from practices offensive to the conscience.

The government is one of the instruments with which the people work, and in its activities it is sure to reflect a dominant public sentiment. As in the corporation the stockholder is often willing to profit by the wrong act of the director, even when he would shrink from doing the wrong act himself, so the citizen will sometimes support his party in doing that which he would hesitate to do as an individual. But this is less likely to happen when he begins to emphasize moral considerations. When one begins to analyze legislation and the administration of the law he is likely to be amazed at the magnitude of the injustice done by this intangible thing which we call government.

LARCENY IN THE FORM OF LAW

Take, for instance, the subject of taxation, the oldest and most constant of all the subjects with which government has had to deal. The supreme court of the United States has described unjust taxation as "larceny in the form of law." It is a harsh phrase, and yet no one will question the propriety of its use. If one citizen is compelled by law to pay ten dollars for the support of the government when he ought only to pay five, and, under the same law, a neighbor is required to pay only five when he should pay ten, the law which causes this in-

equality simply transfers five dollars from one man's pocket to another's.

If we could ascertain the exact amount taken from the overtaxed and given to the undertaxed by the national, state and municipal laws the total sum would be appalling. Unjust taxation is bad enough when the inequality is due to the frailty of human judgment, but it is worse when it is due to deliberate effort upon the part of those who desire to shirk their share of the burdens of government.

Every state has to fight to compel the railroads and other corporations to pay their just proportion of the taxes, and every city has a continuing struggle to force the tax-dodgers to make a return of their property. Under our federal laws almost the entire expense of the government—and the expense is greater than it ought to be—is thrown upon consumption, and the people, instead of paying in proportion to property or income, pay in proportion to what they eat, drink, wear and otherwise use.

Such taxes make the poor man pay more than he should and the rich man less than he should, and yet when an income tax was proposed for the purpose of equalizing the burdens, we were warned that it would defeat the party that favored it, and it did array against the party a large number of those who now escape a considerable part of their share of the federal burdens. It was even urged against the income tax that rich men would perjure themselves to escape it and that they ought not to be driven to this extremity.

TWO PRICES IN THE TAX OFFICE

It is not an uncommon thing for the railroads to set forth the market value of their stock and bonds as the basis of value when rates are under consideration—although the market value of the stock and bonds rests upon exorbitant rates—and then present the cost of reproducing the road as the basis of taxation.

In municipal taxation the corporations holding municipal franchises—franchises of great value and often given to the corporations by corrupt councils—are often taxed on a lower basis than the property of citizens, and

huge business blocks are not infrequently taxed on a lower basis than the small homes.

While allowances must be made for differences of opinion as to the best systems of taxation and the best methods of administration, there can be no difference of opinion as to the desirability of equal and exact justice in the collection of taxes, and no one whose vote affects the subject can excuse himself if he neglects carefully and conscientiously to investigate the various systems proposed. As indifference to the truth is scarcely to be distinguished from willful perversion of the truth, so indifference to the character of laws enacted is scarcely less reprehensible than deliberate support of systems known to be unjust. Every quickening of the individual conscience, therefore, must show itself in better government, and there is no better test of good government than that embodied in the laws relating to taxation.

There has already been an outcry against what is known as graft, a form of money-making in which the officeholder enriches himself at the expense of the public. Graft appears in a multitude of forms, but it has its root in the betrayal of public trust. It is the easiest form of injustice to correct, however, because no one defends the grafter when he is once exposed. The legislator who sells legislation, the purchasing agent who collects a commission from those from whom he buys, and the executive who puts a price upon immunity—all these lose their friends as soon as their misconduct is made public. But the big grafters who remain in the shadow, and make fortunes by the corruption of less prominent men—these are the greater criminals, and their wrongdoing is more harmful to society. Their punishment, too, is more difficult, for they not only stand high themselves but have influential friends. So great has been the injustice done to the public by the granting of perpetual or long time franchises that the more recent constitutions and statutes forbid the granting of a franchise except by a referendum vote. A moral uplift is even now manifesting itself in the effort both to punish the offenders and to protect society more effectively from the conspiracy against its welfare.

The trust question can not be settled until the moral

issues involved are recognized and passed upon. The principle underlying a private monopoly is so easily understood that it is strange that any one should mistake it, and yet men do mistake it, and men who would not think of playing the highwayman behind a mask at night will associate themselves together and, in broad daylight, apply the highwayman methods to industry. What difference is there in morals between one who, putting a revolver to your head, demands your money or your life, and the trust magnate who, cornering a necessity of life, demands an exorbitant price for that which you must have and which he controls? Until recently a trust magnate's money was accepted without question by churches, colleges and charities; but men at the head of religious and benevolent institutions are beginning to inquire about the methods employed by those who have money to give away. It does not require a prophetic eye to foresee the time when this scrutiny will be so close that the exploiters of the nation will find it impossible to take worthy institutions in partnership with them in the distribution of their ill-gotten gains. It will be some punishment to such wrongdoers to be left to enjoy in solitude that which they have gathered together by trampling upon every sentiment of brotherhood.

TRYING TO IMPROVE THE DIVINE PLAN

The broadest indictment that can be brought against present economic conditions in the United States is that the rewards offered by society are not only in accordance with, but are directly subversive of, the law of rewards given us by the Creator. The most imperative duty resting upon the citizen is to bring the government as nearly as possible into harmony with the Divine law.

When God gave us the earth with its fertile soil, the sunshine with its warmth and the showers with their moisture, He proclaimed, as clearly as if His voice had thundered from the clouds: "Go, work, and your reward shall be proportionate to your diligence, intelligence and perseverance." The law has been reversed, and each decade shows a smaller and smaller percentage of the wealth remaining in the hands of the wealth producers, and a

larger and larger proportion in the hands of the non-producers. This condition is not only unnatural, it is dangerous. It is due to man-made privileges and immunitives—to law-made inequalities in distribution. So great have these inequalities become that the president has sounded a note of warning. Protesting that these "swollen fortunes" should not be transmitted to posterity, he has suggested an inheritance tax to compel the predatory classes to disgorge at the grave. I refer to this not for the purpose of discussing remedies, but to emphasize the necessity for a remedy. The hope of the future lies in the belief that a remedy will be applied, and the very fact that a remedy is being considered shows how far reaching is the ethical movement.

To recapitulate: There is a moral awakening that is world-wide in its extent; its effects are especially noticeable in this country, in the growth of altruism, in the increase in church activity, in the larger consideration given to sociological subjects and in the demand for a nearer approach to justice in government. The basis of this movement is the idea of brotherhood, and its purpose is not merely to stay each hand uplifted for another's injury, but to substitute in each the desire to benefit others in the place of the desire to overreach. The means by which the movement is to be advanced is the cultivation of an ideal which will measure life, not by what one gets out of the world, but by what one contributes to the sum of human happiness.—Written by W. J. Bryan for, and copyrighted by, the Saturday Evening Post.

ONE MORE "DEFENDER"

John R. Walsh, proprietor of the Chicago Chronicle and former president of a Chicago national bank, which closed its doors December 16, 1905, was, on January 18, indicted by the federal grand jury for misconduct in the management of the finances of the bank. An Associated Press dispatch from Chicago says:

"The indictment is based upon ninety-two separate transactions in each of which it is claimed the bank's

funds were unlawfully used, and contains 182 counts, based upon the ninety-two financial operations conducted by Mr. Walsh. It is claimed that Mr. Walsh placed in the bank twenty-two 'memorandum notes' aggregating in face value $2,090,000 and placed the proceeds to the credit of his personal account. Thirteen unlawful transactions in the bonds of the Southern Indiana and Illinois Southern railways, owned by Mr. Walsh, are also charged, it being alleged that Mr. Walsh sold these bonds to the bank and placed the proceeds amounting to $822,-200 to his personal credit. It is charged in the indictment that the money secured by these transactions was paid by Mr. Walsh to the Southern Indiana and Illinois Southern railways and other enterprises of his own. Mr. Walsh was arrested March 2, 1906, charged with violation of the federal banking laws, and on May 3 he was held to await the action of the federal grand jury. Since then he has been under a bond of $50,000."

It will be remembered that Mr. Walsh and his newspaper were so devoted to national honor in 1896, that, although pretending to be democrats, they could not give their support to the democratic ticket. Yet a federal grand jury alleges that this purist has been guilty of ninty-two financial transactions that will not bear the light of day.

Verily some of these 1896 defenders were so busy looking after the "national honor" that they had no time to take care of their own.

THE STARCH TRUST

The National Starch company and the Corn Products Refining company, which together form the starch trust, in an advertisement in the New York newspapers announcing an issue of bonds to retire other bonds, say: "Of the many active and well-maintained starch plants throughout the United States which constituted the original security for the payment of your bonds, only two are now in operation. The remainder, having been idle for several years, are dismantled, uninsured and rapidly

deteriorating, so that without attention they will soon become valueless for factory purposes."

It was Secretary Shaw who said "a protective tariff is not the mother of trusts, though it is the parent of a condition that makes it profitable for capital to combine."

HE KEPT THE FAITH

In the death of David Overmeyer, Kansas loses a useful citizen, and the democracy of the state and nation lose a faithful champion. Mr. Overmeyer was a man of high ideals and stood by democratic principles when many others deserted them. With him democracy was not merely a party to belong to and a ticket to be voted for, but it was a living faith. In Kansas, and in all other states where the name of David Overmeyer is honored and loved, men will be told that David Overmeyer kept the faith.

THINK OF THIS!

Speaking before a class at Columbia University, Henry L. Call of Washington presented statistics showing:

One per cent of our population owns practically 99 per cent of the entire wealth of the nation. Our 18,000,000 wage earners receive an average of but $400 per year. Nine-tenths of our business men are notoriously failures. Our clergy receive an average annual salary of about $500; the average for educators is even lower. Of our 6,000,000 farmers, one-third are tenants and the homes of one-third of the remaining two-thirds are mortgaged.

Mr. Call makes a very gloomy showing and even though one believe he has painted the picture too darkly, observing men know—in the absence of statistics—that the situation is serious enough to demand the thoughtful consideration of patriotic men.

THE INTERNATIONAL MARRIAGE

A British peer recently married the daughter of an American millionaire, having settled upon himself an income of $100,000 a year by the father of his wife. He conferred upon the American girl his title and the right to wear the family jewels. A few years have passed and the couple have signed articles of separation, divorce proceedings having been avoided, it is said, by intercession of King Edward. The British peer retains his income of 100,000 American dollars, and the wife retains the title she bought and the right to wear the family jewels. This is a sample of "international commerce" that does not commend itself to those old-fashioned people who believe that marriage should be the result of love, not of barter and sale.

THE ASSET CURRENCY BILL SCHEME

A few pertinent questions suggest themselves: Whence this sudden demand for an asset currency? The long session of congress adjourned last summer. The senate and house were in session some eight months but the subject was not considered. Now congress is convened for a three months' session and all of the energies that the banking fraternity can command are being put forth to push the bill through. Why were the financiers quiet during an eight months' session and why are they so active during the three months' session? The answer is easy. The long session came before the election; the present session is held after the election, and the financiers, following their invariable rule, are attempting to steal a march upon the people. The scheme was deliberately laid; it is being studiously carried out; will it succeed?

The present bill is put forward as a means of securing an elastic currency. What is an elastic currency? A currency which can be contracted and expanded, but by whom? By the bankers of course. Has this subject ever been up before? Many times. Has congress ever expressed itself upon the subject? Very clearly. There is a clause in the national banking law which prohibits the

retirement of more than three million dollars in any one month or a maximum of thirty-six millions in a year. Why was that clause put in there? To prevent a contraction of the currency by the banks. Up to 1896 we only had about two hundred and ten millions of dollars of national bank currency outstanding. With the limitation of three millions per month it was not possible for the bankers to contract that currency more than about fifteen per cent a year. This limitation has been kept upon the banks until now, and the fact that it has been kept shows that the public has not been willing to trust the bankers with the enormous power.

The bill now under consideration permits an issue of nearly forty per cent more currency by the banks, and this new currency they can not only issue at will but retire at will. In other words, they ask to be empowered to exercise a power more dangerous than that which has been entrusted to them for years. What has happened in recent years to justify this increased confidence in the bankers? Have not the recent investigations tended to lessen rather than to increase the confidence? Bankers are human beings. The opponents of an asset currency do not assume that they are worse than other people, but is it fair to assume that they are so much better than others as to be entrusted with this vast power over the industries and the business of the country? Was the country wrong in not removing the three million dollar limit? If it was right to refuse to remove this limit, it would be wrong to grant to the bankers a much larger power over the currency than the repeal of the three million dollar limit would give them.

This is called an emergency currency but it is really an asset currency pure and simple, for the bank issues upon its assets. To be sure there is a guarantee fund. Whether the government guarantees the emergency notes fully or only so long as the fund lasts is a question, for the language is not clear. The bill will doubtless be amended so as to make it certain whether the assurance of the government is a complete guarantee or only a conditional one, but if it is a complete guarantee, the government must proceed to collect the notes from the assets of the bank, for there is no special fund such as the government

bond as in the case of the present national bank note. The measure before congress is a compromise. The advocates of an asset currency have been insisting for several years that the banks should be allowed to issue upon their assets. There was so much opposition to this that the present plan was proposed as a compromise, but one need not be a prophet to foresee that this is but the entering wedge to the straightout asset currency. (While this is in reality an asset currency it is called an emergency currency and for the time being the tax laid upon it is intended to force its retirement when the emergency is over. But as a matter of fact many of the banks will find it profitable to keep the currency out all the time and the banks that do not find it profitable will begin a crusade for reduction of the tax in order that the currency may be kept out all of the time.)

An asset currency lessens the security of depositors. Efforts have been made to secure the protection of depositors by a guarantee fund but the banks oppose this. Now they propose to still further increase the risk of depositors by making their assets the basis of new liabilities. The fact that these notes are emergency notes increases the danger rather than lessens it, for the issue of notes by the bank will be a sign of distress, and unless human nature changes, the issue of notes by a bank will be more likely to cause a run on the bank than to relieve any stringency in the locality. If bank depositors were made absolutely secure, money would be drawn from hiding and bank deposits would be increased; an emergency currency is likely to drive money into hiding and decrease bank deposits.

The banks, according to the bill, are to pay three per cent interest on the notes outstanding, but this is only temporary. It is a concession to the fears of those who have opposed an asset currency. If the plan succeeds, we may expect a demand—after the next election, not before—for a reduction of the rate of interest. After the election of 1896 the bankers demanded and secured a reduction in the tax on national bank notes. Not a word was said about this in the campaign but the favor was demanded and granted when the campaign was over. The bankers went through the campaign shouting that there

was money enough, and when the election was over they demanded and secured the right to issue the face value of the bonds instead of ninety per cent, and they did it on the ground that more money was needed.

Ten years ago the banking fraternity insisted that the country had enough money; that all that was needed was confidence. Now with more than fifty per cent increase in the per capita circulation, they are asking for still more money—not government money—not primary money—but money which they can issue at a profit to themselves, and what is worse, all the newspapers which the banks control are joining in the chorus.

All bank currency is open to three objections: First, it is a matter of favoritism. If an ordinary citizen owns bonds, he has had the money invested in the bonds and must be satisfied with the interest; the bank, however, on the other hand, is permitted to draw interest on its bonds and to issue the face value of the bonds in bank notes. The asset currency gives even a greater advantage because the bank is not required to make any investment at all. Its capital is the security upon which the depositors rely and it wants to make a double use of this security by issuing new liabilities called emergency notes and the government is to stand behind them.

The second objection to the bank of issue is that it gives the banks a control over the volume of the currency, and as has been shown, the present bill is intended to very largely increase this control.

The third objection is that the surrender of the governmental function of issuing money into the hands of the bankers gives to those bankers what they regard as a vested interest in the nation's finances, and they resent interference with what they come to regard as their private business.

Fourth, the asset currency is open to an objection which does not lie against the bank currency, namely, that it introduces a larger favoritism and more dangerous control over the currency and greater risks to the depositors. If the government guarantees the notes, the people at large bear the burden while the bank gets the benefit. If the government does not guarantee the notes,

then they are unsafe and will be an element of weakness in our currency.

The banks insist that more money is needed at some seasons of the year than at other seasons. Why not provide for this increase by keeping a larger reserve in the dull season so that there will be more money to loan for the moving of crops? Why not? Because that would reduce the profits of the bank and that of course is not to be thought of.

If the banks really want an emergency currency without changing the character of the present bank note, why do they not advocate a reduction of the amount to be issued on the bonds in ordinary times, leaving the remainder of the bonds to be issued upon in an emergency? If, for instance, the banks were allowed to issue seventy-five per cent of the face value of the bonds in ordinary times and allowed to issue the other twenty-five per cent in an emergency upon the payment of a tax which would retire the bonds at the end of the emergency period, the same result would be secured. But why is this not proposed? Because it would reduce the profit of the bank. Whenever it is proposed that the banks do something in which there is no profit, they at once point out that banking is a matter of business and that bankers will not do anything unless there is profit in sight.

No one who is familiar with the methods employed by the financiers can doubt that the new currency bill before the house is the camel's nose. All that the bankers ask is that the nose be allowed to come into the tent at this time—the rest of the camel will appear later. An asset currency is the thing desired, and an asset currency without tax, not for emergencies but for the permanent profit of the bank. It is now more than two years since Secretary Shaw pointed out that a continuation of the present national bank system would require a permanent national debt as a basis or some other basis for the notes, and this is the other basis. The scheme will be developed—after the election—as soon and as fast as the people will stand it.

ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST

MR. BRYAN'S RECENT WESTERN TRIP

The readers of The Commoner may be interested in a few notes on a lecture trip which I recently took to the Pacific coast. Mrs. Bryan accompanied me, and we were away from home just a month. We went northwest through Montana and northern Idaho to Washington; thence south along the coast to Los Angeles and back through Utah and Wyoming.

The cities of Billings, Livingston, Butte, Great Falls, Helena and Missoula (all in Montana) are growing and prospering. Billings is one of the greatest wool-shipping points in the country and has doubled its population in the last few years. Livingston, being the point at which tourists leave the main line for the Yellowstone Park, is a busy place in the summer and an attractive little city at all times. Butte is in the center of the great copper producing section—some sixty million dollars worth of ore being taken out of the ground in the immediate neighborhood. It is one of the busiest places in the west.

Helena, Montana's capital, was entertaining the legislature when we were there and was therefore quite lively. The city has a beautiful location and is further favored by having near it some celebrated hot springs. Great Falls is situated near the falls of the Missouri and can boast of a water power of something like one hundred thousand horse power when fully developed. Use is now made of about 10,000 horse power, and the saving of coal is estimated at $450,000 per year. One of the greatest springs in the world—the fountains of the Missouri—is only about four miles from the city.

Missoula has the state university and is the distributing center of the Bitter Root Valley and a large mining country. Moscow was the only Idaho city visited. It is situated in the edge of the Palouse country—one of the greatest wheat producing sections of the world. The state university of Idaho is at Moscow, and it was this that led us to visit it, for in lecturing I give the preference to college towns. Spokane is the principal commercial city of eastern Washington and is growing rapidly. It has

splendid water power within the city limits and is the distributing point for a large farming and mining territory.

Pullman and Cheney, which we visited are college towns not far from Spokane, the former having the State Agricultural College and College of Mechanical Arts and the latter a Normal College. Wenatchee and North Yakima are in the center of Washington, one on the Columbia and the other on the Yakima river. They are in the fruit section of Oregon and one has an opportunity to see some excellent samples of the best of all fruits, the apple. Seattle is having a veritable boom, being the natural distributing point for the Alaska trade and enjoying in addition its share of the commerce across the Pacific. Seattle is situated on a series of hills and somewhat resembles Kansas City in this respect, but the hills in Seattle, as in Kansas City, instead of discouraging the enterprise of the citizens, seem to be a stimulus. Yakima is as admirably situated as Seattle but has been discriminated against by the railroads since the Northwestern has become an ally of the Great Northern. Olympia, the capital of the state, while a pleasant residence city, has not shared in the commercial development like its sisters, Seattle and Tacoma. Portland has grown wonderfully in the past decade and has an assured future.

Mount Tacoma, as it is called at Tacoma, and Rainier, as it is called at Seattle, is within sight of both of these cities, and as one can stand at the water's level and look upon it, it presents one of the most sublime mountain views in the world. From a hill in the suburbs of Portland one can see the snowclad peaks of Mount Hood, Mount Adams and St. Helens. Few cities of the size are so near the mountain peaks, and none combine mountain scenery with that along a river like the Columbia. We stopped at Eugene, where the Oregon State University is located, and again at Ashland, the main city of southern Oregon. In this state, also, apples of a high grade are grown. At Hood River the Spitzenberg is the favorite. In Rogue Valley the New Town Pippin commands the highest price, the latter being sold largely in England.

At Santa Rosa, Cal., we saw the first evidences of the

earthquake that visited the Pacific coast last year, but the city is rapidly recuperating. At this place we had the pleasure of meeting the famous Burbank, whose success in introducing new plants has given him the name of the Wizard. He is just now devoting a large share of his time to the propagating of the spineless cactus, which is destined to convert the arid lands of the desert into valuable pastures, for the cattle are very fond of the spineless cactus.

At San Francisco we saw the devastation wrought by the fire that followed the earthquake. The city presents a scene of desolation surpassing our imagination, but the citizens have gone to work heroically to rebuild the town, and while they have a vast task before them, there is no doubt that the city will in the end be more beautiful even than it was before the fateful days of last April. Ex-Mayor Phelan, who is in charge of the relief fund, showed us over the city and gave us a brief description of the splendid work which the commission has accomplished.

At San Jose, Cal., we found a flourishing city surrounded by the most celebrated prune groves of the world. A large percentage of the entire prune crop comes from this immediate vicinity, and as it is a continuing crop, the city is built upon an enduring basis.

Los Angeles is a constant surprise to the visitor. At first a health resort, it has become a great manufacturing city and is destined to play an important part in the development of Oriental and South American trade. Pasadena, the popular health resort, is but a few miles distant, and there one sees many beautiful villas which serve as winter homes for the wealthy families of the East.

An electric car line connects Los Angeles with Mt. Lowe, and connects with a cable road and another electric line carrying the visitors to a height of some five thousand feet. One can have a variety of experiences in Los Angeles at this season of the year. He can gather snowballs on Mt. Lowe, and returning through the orange groves laden with yellow fruit, can within a few hours enjoy the surf, the ocean water being practically the same temperature the year round.

Near Los Angeles is the island of Catilina. It is some twenty-five miles from the main land and is the summer

resort of southern California. The most attractive feature of the island is its submarine garden. Perhaps I ought to say gardens, for at several points around the island the sea plants present a most interesting sight. These are seen through glass-bottom boats. The variety of plant life and the fishes of different kinds and colors feeding in the waters present a most enchanting view.

We returned on the new shortline road running from Utah to southern California and passed through the orange groves that have been such a source of wealth to southern California. We brought back a large basket full of the oranges which democrats brought to the train as we journeyed eastward.

Salt Lake and Ogden, while not growing as rapidly as the coast cities, are still constantly adding to their population, and each year substantial buildings take the place of more temporary structures.

Grand Junction, Colo., another city visited, presented a remarkable illustration of the value of irrigation. Some of the orchards in this favored locality have sold for from fifteen hundred to twenty-five hundred dollars an acre and are today paying interest upon that valuation. Laramie, Wyo., is the home of the State University and has the distinction of being one of the highest cities in the United States. Its altitude is about 7,100 feet, and it lies in a plateau on the top of the Rockies, the mountain ridge of the range lying to the west of it, while to the east of it another spur of the Rockies rises to the height of about 8,000 feet.

In the course of the journey I addressed the legislatures of Montana, Washington, Oregon and Wyoming, the invitation being even more appreciated because the republicans have a majority in all of these bodies. The invitation extended by the House of Representatives of Utah could not be accepted owing to lack of time.

I attended democratic banquets during the month's absence at Spokane, North Yakima, Seattle, Tacoma and Los Angeles; addressed a democratic meeting at Salem, Ore., at which Governor Chamberlain presided; attended non-partisan dinners at Livingston, Helena and Missoula, Mont., Wenatchee and Pullman, Wash., Santa Rosa, Los Angeles, Salt Lake and Laramie and Chey-

enne, Wyo. When I add that I enjoyed the hospitality of Governor Toole of Montana, and Governor Mead of Washington, and addressed numerous schools, colleges and other non-partisan gatherings, the reader will not doubt that the month was fully and pleasantly occupied.

The whole west is aroused on the subject of railroads, having suffered from a car shortage, coal famine and discriminating rates. One of the train crew on the Northern Pacific complained that since that road had passed under the Hill influence the effort to increase the tonnage without increasing the operating expenses had resulted in the overworking of the employes, the man in question having been twenty-four hours without sleep. The citizens of the coast are expecting great things from the Milwaukee and from the Gould road which is approaching San Francisco from Salt Lake.

The Japanese question is the subject of paramount importance. It is interesting to see what staunch defenders of the reserved rights of the state the republicans of California, Washington and Oregon have become. They appreciate the importance of state control of schools, and yet, a year ago it would have been difficult to have interested them in a discussion of the line which separates the state from the nation. Abstract theories do not attract much attention but it is different when the theories are applied to important questions.

The readers of The Commoner will be glad to know that there is no division among the democrats of the west as to the next campaign. They are unanimous in the belief that the democratic party should move forward in the reforms which were set forth in the platforms of 1896 and 1900. There is no disposition anywhere to compromise with predatory wealth or to make the party the apologist for the monopolies which are now preying upon the wealth producers. The democrats of the coast states appreciate the educational work that President Roosevelt has done, but they do not expect reform from the republican leaders because of the influence which corporate wealth exerts over the republican organization. There is apparent everywhere the enthusiasm that was manifested among the democrats in 1896, while among the republicans there is doubt and division. The signs

indicate that the West is ready to join the South and the Mississippi Valley in the inauguration of reform.

RATE LEGISLATION NECESSARY

The democrats in congress and in every state should urge legislation authorizing the various railway commissions to ascertain the present value of the railroads, measured by the cost of reproducing them. Senator La Follette offered an amendment to the rate bill when it was before the senate authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to ascertain the value of all the railroads in the United States. The democrats supported the amendment but every republican senator except La Follette voted against it. The vote on this amendment demonstrated very clearly that the republican leaders do not desire effective regulation, for how can the commission determine what rate is reasonable without knowing upon what valuation the roads should be permitted to collect dividends? The democrats in congress should renew the fight and urge the passage of a law giving this power to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Put the republicans on record so that the voters can see how empty are the promises of reform made by the republican leaders. In each state the democrats should attempt to confer this power on state commissions. When government ownership is suggested, regulation is offered as a substitute, but when real and effective regulation is attempted it is strenuously opposed by the very same persons who oppose government ownership. Now is a good time for the democrats to unmask the pretenders. It is not enough to stop rebates; while this puts all shippers on an equal footing it really helps the railroads more than it does the general public. The larger problem is the protection of the public from extortionate rates and this problem cannot be undertaken until we know how much of the present capitalization is real value and how much is water. The first thing to be done is to separate the real from the fictitious. Now is the time to act.

INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS

Recent investigations show that the various railroads are buying stock in each other. They should not be permitted to do so and a brief statute would prevent it. For instance: "It shall be unlawful for any railroad engaged in interstate commerce to own any stock in any other railroad and it shall likewise be unlawful for any of the directors or officials of any railroad to own stock in any other railroad." Such a statute with the necessary provisions for its enforcement is needed at this time. Have the railroads influence enough to prevent the passage of such a measure?

SOCIETY'S BAN

A reader of The Commoner directs attention to the following extract from an editorial that appeared in the New York Sun: "The great, and for the present the insuperable, obstacle to substantial betterment in public life is the apathy and indifference of society. So long as society approves, countenances and tolerates scoundrels who have successfully eluded the police, the criminal courts and the jails, so long will rascality continue to thrive. * * * If society would refuse to 'know' men of known flagitious lives and of established evil reputation; if it would drop them from its visiting list, cut them in the street and avoid them at the club; if otherwise reputable and unbesmirched men would refuse to serve with them on the directorates of corporations or on vestries or in all honorary associations, then we should see a very different state of affairs. Avoidance of the ruder penalties of the law would not be the only solicitude of the 'criminal rich,' for there is one thing they dread more than the courts, more than the penitentiary and more than all else, more even than they dread poverty, and that is society's formal decree of non possumus."

It may be a little difficult to find anyone having the authority to put the ban as suggested by the Sun. But

while waiting for "society's formal decree of non possumus," we might try the experiment of putting in the penitentiary some of the "criminal rich" who prey upon the necessities of the people. If the Sun's "society decree" is good for the "criminal rich," why not apply it to the criminal poor? Yet the Sun would be the very first to protest if a common everyday thief were given the benefit of the Sun's plan for the "punishment" of those who violate the law.

JOHN A. CREIGHTON—PHILANTHROPIST

The death of John A. Creighton, upon whom the pope had conferred the title of Count, removes one of the greatest philanthropists of the west. Mr. Creighton was a democrat of prominence and a leader in the business world, but he was above all a big-hearted, open-handed benefactor. His money was his servant and he delighted to bestow it upon worthy enterprises. Rev. M. J. Dowling, president of Creighton University, whose intimate acquaintance with Mr. Creighton qualified him to speak, delivered an eloquent and well deserved tribute at the funeral. Count Creighton's life is additional proof of the truth of the statement that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

THE DIRECT PRIMARY

Democrats may differ among themselves and from republicans as to the details of a direct primary bill, but these differences will not lead them to oppose the direct primary. It is democratic and no democrat can afford to vote against it. The expense of the primary should be borne by the city, county or state rather than by the candidates, for a tax upon the candidates tends to restrict the offices and make money the test in office holding.

The Commoner prefers the plan which compels the voter to announce his party affiliations, for without this

the majority party might make the nominations for the minority party as well, but this is a detail. When the democrats have done their best to perfect the bill they should support it and correct the defects in the measure later.

NEBRASKA AND THE SHIP SUBSIDY

Both houses of the Nebraska legislature, republican, have adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, There is now pending in congress a measure in the interest of the great ship companies, known as the Ship Subsidy bill, and

Whereas, Such a measure is a direct grant of special privileges and not in the interest of the people, and undoubtedly opposed by more than nine-tenths of the people of Nebraska; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the senate of Nebraska, that our senators be instructed and representatives in congress be requested to work and vote for the defeat of such measure, or any like bill, and

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each senator and representative in congress, and to those who have been elected but who have not yet taken their seats.

This represents the sentiments of Nebraska regardless of political prejudice and Nebraska congressmen who are tempted to vote for the ship subsidy will do well to take notice.

NO TARIFF REVISION

The fact that it seems to be generally agreed that there will be no tariff revision at this session of congress should provide food for those republicans who, having no ax to grind, are chiefly concerned in the public welfare. Why are we not to have tariff revision? Is it because public interests or public sentiment does not demand it? There is abundant testimony, even for one who does not take the democratic view of the tariff ques-

tion, to show that public interests demand tariff revision, while the very earnest and renewed appeals made by republicans all over the country in favor of revision of the tariff ought to convince even those who are usually non-observing that such revision would be clearly in line with present day public sentiment.

The republican party must certainly be a well disciplined organization else the stand-patters of this period would not advance a proposition which, we make bold to say, is controverted not only by the opinion of the rank and file of republicans but has been publicly repudiated by some of the most distinguished republican statesmen and editors.

In this day the trusts find in the tariff larger shelter than they ever before enjoyed, and the American public feels more keenly than at any other time in history the impositions due to an enormously high protective tariff. Even the men who framed the present tariff law had no idea that the American people would long tamely submit to those rates, and we have it on the authority of Senator Dolliver of Iowa that Mr. Dingley explained that many of the rates in his tariff bill were purposely placed high in order that they might be used in bringing about reciprocity with other countries. But now republican leaders refuse to make any serious moves in behalf of reciprocity, and at the same time they insist upon maintaining the exorbitant rates.

In 1888 John Sherman, then a member of the United States senate, said: "Whenever this free competition is evaded or avoided by combination of individuals or corporations, the duty should be reduced and foreign competition promptly invited."

In 1891 Senator Plumb of Kansas objected to the McKinley tariff bill because, as he said: "There are dozens of lines of manufactures covered by the terms of this bill, which are controlled by trusts," and Senator Plumb added that the best way "to start out trying to reduce the exactions of trusts" was to "cut down the shelter behind which trusts are created."

Several years ago the Iowa republican convention and the Idaho republican convention adopted in their platforms planks demanding "any modification of the tariff

schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to monopoly." Even in Connecticut a republican convention held several years ago declared "if in any schedule import duties are found that have been notoriously perverted from their true purpose to the inordinate enrichment of corporations, monopolistic in fact or in tendency, we look to a republican congress to apply in its wisdom the needed corrective without impairing the principle of protection."

The late Governor Mount of Indiana in a public speech delivered in 1899 expressed similar views. Former Senator Washburn gave out in 1899 a number of newspaper interviews in which he said that republicans who had the welfare of their party and their country at heart must call a halt upon their party's tendency to connect itself with trusts and must insist that the tariff shelter enjoyed by the trusts be destroyed.

The Chicago Record-Herald, the Minneapolis Journal, the New York Commercial Advertiser, the Portland Oregonian, the Hartford Courant, the Dubuque (Iowa) Times, The Philadelphia Ledger, the St. Paul Pioneer-Press, the Rockford (Ill.) Republican, the Keokuk (Iowa) Gate City, the Indianapolis News and the Chicago Tribune—all republican papers long ago and repeatedly demanded the removal of tariff duties from commodities controlled by trusts.

In 1901 Representative Babcock of Wisconsin delivered a number of public speeches and gave out a number of newspaper interviews in all of which he said that the consumers must be protected; that it was impossible to defend a tariff policy which simply inures to the benefit of those who may secure the control of a commodity, and that the interests of the party as well as the interests of the public demanded the destruction of the shelter which the trusts find in the tariff.

The Chicago Tribune went so far as to say that the most of the fortune amassed by Andrew Carnegie "came out of the pockets of his countrymen through the operation of unequal laws," and that Mr. Carnegie should never forget that he made his money "through the undue favoritism of the government of the United States."

Such opinions as these were long ago and repeatedly

expressed by republican statesmen and republican editors. It is true that "wise men change their views," but will any one seriously contend that in the light of present day conditions the views of these gentlemen have been changed? Would any of them care to explicitly repudiate the sentiments they expressed as hereinbefore outlined? We know they would not. We know that the conditions against which they indignantly protested ten, fifteen and twenty years ago have so multiplied that they have become well nigh unbearable; we know that the sentiment, even among the rank and file of the republican party, is so pronouncedly in favor of tariff revision that a number of republican politicians who have never been charged with an undue disregard for their own political fortunes have made bold to demand tariff revision, at least to the extent of destroying the shelter which the trusts find in the republican tariff law. Yet in the face of these facts we are told that there is no probability whatever that there will be tariff revision. What is the explanation? It is that the rank and file of the republican party have lost all control over their organization; that the special interests which republican leaders have so long and so faithfully served have secured such perfect control over the party that no amount of publicly expressed indignation can disturb that control. It means that the republican party is wedded to its idols.

FROM JACKSON TO ROOSEVELT

In an editorial entitled "From Jackson to Roosevelt" the Wall Street Journal says:

"The signing of the Aldrich bill is the first important step in the abolishing of the independent treasury system which was established in Van Buren's administration as a result of Jackson's war on the United States bank. From Jackson to Roosevelt covers a period of over seventy years."

Evidently the Aldrich bill is entitled to considerable more attention than it is receiving in the editorial columns of American newspapers.

A REMARKABLE EDITORIAL

In its issue of March 6 the Wall Street Journal, which is evidently the most conscientious financial publication in Wall street, printed a three-line editorial. It was one of the best editorials ever printed in an American newspaper. It ought to be displayed in every Wall street counting-room; and not only in Wall street but throughout the world. With all of its simplicity it is a remarkable editorial; remarkable alike for its brevity and its truth. Here it is:

"The Human and the Divine: The mere human in us working alone barely earns expenses; it is the divine in us that yields dividends."

GRATIFYING

The Wall Street Journal says: "Too much importance cannot be attached to the interview between J. Pierpont Morgan and President Roosevelt. It is of course absurd to say that as a result of this interview either Mr. Morgan will surrender his independence or that President Roosevelt will reverse the great policy of government regulation with which his name is identified."

It is gratifying to be assured that Mr. Roosevelt will not "reverse the great policy of government regulation." But it is of the highest importance that Mr. Morgan will not "surrender his independence." Mr. Morgan has the habit of surrendering points of vantage. It would be too bad altogether if he "surrendered that independence" for which he has become famous.

GOING DEMOCRATIC

The republican legislature in Nebraska passed a two-cent railroad fare bill. The two-cent fare provision was in the democratic state platform but was conspicuous by

its absence from the republican state platform. The republican legislature is, therefore, to be congratulated, like the republican president, for occasionally going democratic.

MR. BRYAN'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE

The Seattle Post-Intelligencer gives the following account of the address delivered by Mr. Bryan before the Washington legislature in accordance with an invitation issued in the form of a joint resolution:

Olympia, Jan 8.—William Jennings Bryan addressed the legislature, assembled in joint session, this morning. He was accompanied by Governor Mead. The galleries were packed, and the distinguished publicist was accorded a warm welcome, expressed in applause and personal greetings.

The tap of the gavel brought the legislators to their feet when Mr. Bryan and the joint committee that waited on him were announced. He was the recipient of generous applause as he marched down the aisle. In a brief sentence the lieutenant governor introduced Mr. Bryan as "one of the most distinguished citizens of the world."

He spoke for fully an hour on the topic of the duty of legislators to the people, the crying needs of the hour in the nation, the ethics of public service and the great questions and issues of the day, with which he has been identified since his return from abroad.

At the close of his address he was extended a vote of thanks by the joint assembly, on motion of Senator Paulhamus, of Pierce county. An informal reception followed at the speaker's desk.

The following is the speech, and as it is substantially the same as that delivered before the Montana, Oregon and Wyoming legislatures, it is given in full as reported in the Post-Intelligencer:

Mr. Speaker, Your Excellency—the Governor, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and Ladies and Gentlemen:

I desire in the first place to acknowledge my indebtedness to the members of the legislature for the high compliment which they pay me in inviting me to speak in this chamber. This honor is the more appreciated because it comes from those who do not agree with me in party affiliation or upon all political questions. I am glad that we can recognize the right of people to their own opinions—that we can respect opinions even when we do not agree with them. I have had much in my career to teach me charity of opinion and liberality toward political opponents, for while I have passed through some bitter campaigns, there is much more that I can remember with pleasure than that I now recall with sorrow or pain. I am in politics almost as badly mixed as I am in religion. In religion I could not place much emphasis upon church creeds even if I wanted to. I remember hearing a southern Methodist preacher tell when I was a boy of a mill to which many people brought wheat. He said that some came from the hill and some along the river route but that when they reached the mill, the miller did not ask them which road they came by but whether the wheat was good. I have thought of this story a good many times, and it often applies to politics. When I first went to Washington as a congressman I had an idea that all virtue was to be found in the democratic party and that all vice was to be found in the republican party; but after I had been in congress awhile, I found that there were some bad democrats and that there were many good republicans, and this made me a little more charitable in my opinions. When I became a candidate for the presidency some of the democrats left me and some of the republicans came to my support, and after careful consideration I made up my mind that I would rather look a republican in the face than a democrat in the back.

Among members of parties you will find the same distinctions that are to be found between parties. In every country where there is a free expression of public opinion one party will be found going toward the people and the other either going away from the people or obstructing the progress toward reform. These distinctions, though not so aggravated, are to be found

within the different parties. In every party you will find some more advanced than others who are considering remedial legislation. The two great parties of this country are the republican party which is in power in the nation and the democratic party, which by all considerations ought to be in power. One of these parties must necessarily be nearer to the people than the other, but you will also find among the republicans reformers and conservatives; and in the democratic party there are radical democrats and democrats not so radical, so that it is sometimes difficult to draw the line between the conservative democrat and the radical republican.

When I was in Japan I found that they had what they called Korean lions before the doors of the temple, one on each side. These Korean lions are rather interesting animals; they do not look ferocious like the Numidian lion but are rather comical in appearance. What struck me, however, is that one of these lions has his mouth open while the other has his mouth shut. We are told that they represented an idea—the eternal conflict between the positive and the negative. One says Yes—the other says No, and progress lies between the two.

The reformer asserts something and the timid man says "No, it is not wise." Or he may simply say "I am not convinced. I am not sure." It is necessary to have both of these elements in society, if it were not for the conservative the radical would go too fast, and if it were not for the radical, the conservative would not go at all. So, when I speak to a body like this even though all belong to an opposing party, I know that there will be differences of opinion among them. In this country we could by unanimous consent dissolve all parties and create one great party, to be known as the republican party or the democratic party, or by any other name, but it would last just one day. The next day there would be two parties organized within this one party and they would represent the radical and the conservative elements. This is not only necessary but it is for the best.

I desire to present some thoughts to you, and I do not know how I can better show my appreciation of the

courtesy extended to me by you as members of this legislative body and by His Excellency, the Governor, than by presenting some things which I believe to be worthy the consideration of law-makers and of citizens. I do not draw a very great distinction between the law-maker and the citizen, for the citizen of today is the law-maker of tomorrow; and every citizen ought to be sufficiently informed upon public questions to be able to respond at any time to the call of his associates and become a law-maker. However, before entering upon this subject I desire to say a word about your approaching exposition. I hope to attend it in 1909. You have made such wonderful progress since I was here nearly seven years ago that I am anxious to come when I can see your progress represented in a great exposition. I am a believer in the exposition. It is entirely in accord with my idea of economy and the expenditure of public money. I am opposed to subsidies to individuals or corporations for the aid of private enterprises, but I am in favor of appropriations for educational work and for experiment. If the government spends money in experimenting, the whole public get the benefit of the experiment, and it is a legitimate use of public money. Money spent for educational purposes is spent for the general good, and I believe that an exposition is a great educational institution. I favored appropriations for expositions when in congress. I believe that the federal government should have an exhibit wherever there is an exposition. Not one in a thousand of your population could visit the city of Washington and see the workings of the government, but if you have an exposition here, the government can have an exhibit and thus bring its work before many times as many citizens as can get a glimpse of what is being done in Washington. Whenever there is a local interest sufficient to organize an exposition, the government should make an exhibit. It is bringing the government to the people because the people cannot go to the government. Then, too, expositions enable us to exchange opinions; the more we mingle together, the better we understand each other and the less danger there is of disagreements. The East and the West should fraternize with each other more;

the people of the North and the South should become better acquainted.

An exposition has another advantage. It lowers rates; if you cannot get lower rates in any other way, you are sure to get them through an exposition.

But to my subject. There are three matters which I desire to present to you briefly. One is the position of the representative; there are two theories which prevail among us, and they are to be found wherever representative government exists. One is that the representative is elected to think for the people; the other is that the people think for themselves and elect representatives to act for them. The difference between those theories is clearly marked although it may not be easy to separate those who follow one theory from those who believe in the other. Every representative, however, leans in opinion toward one theory or the other, and it makes a great deal of difference which way he leans. I am a believer in the second theory, namely—that the people think for themselves and elect representatives not to think for them but to act for them. This theory is consistent with our ideas of government, and I will give you two or three reasons which lead me to believe that it is generally accepted among the people. In the first place we have the constitution. By whom is the constitution adopted? By the people. And what does the constitution do? It regulates the legislative body, directs, limits and controls, and why? Because there is more virtue in the people than finds expression through their representatives. In our organic law the people seek to put a grip upon the representatives, they hedge them about to prevent misrepresentation. This is proof that the representative is expected to represent.

Another proof is found in the fact that we have platforms. When we go into a campaign we present candidates who are pledged to certain platforms. Now, why is a platform adopted? Surely that the people may know what the representative will do if elected. And this information is given to the people in order that they may decide which candidate to support. If we accepted the doctrine that the representative should think for the people; we would not hamper him or direct him

with the platform. When we adopt a platform we indicate that we believe that the representative is bound by the will of the people. In other words, the adoption of a platform establishes the fact that the representative is the servant and not the master of the people.

The faults of our government are not in the people themselves but in the representatives of the people; and it is not because the representatives lack intelligence, for I am not flattering this legislative body when I say that all over this union the members of the legislature are not below the average of the people in intelligence. I might even say without exaggeration that the representatives are above the average in intelligence. Their faults, I repeat, do not come from lack of intelligence but from the fact that they sometimes yield to the temptation to put their own interests above the interests of the people whom they serve. This is the weakness of legislative bodies, and therefore it is always necessary that the representative should remember that he is the servant of the people; that they may speak through him and have their wishes respected.

We have for a great many years had the telegraph system. A man can stand at an instrument here and talk to a man many miles away by means of a wire stretched between the two instruments. In legislative bodies we have sometimes seen the principle of the telegraph illustrated. The man in the legislature is at one end of the wire and some influential corporation at the other end. The man in the legislature is sometimes not free to do his own will but accepts directions from the hidden man at the other end of the wire.

More recently we have been using the wireless system of telegraphy, and it illustrates what we ought to have in the legislature. In the wireless system there is no communication by wire but the message is transmitted through the air. There are two instruments attuned to each other, and the message sent by one is taken by the other. It would be a great improvement if we could substitute the wireless system for the system that we have had, and have the legislator so attuned to the people as to be able to catch the message from them and be a real representative of his constituents.

This, then, in the conception of a legislator's duties, manifests itself in various changes suggested in the methods of government. If you believe in a theory you naturally endeavor to make everything conform to that theory. Consistency is a powerful thing and has a great influence upon the human mind. Show me a man who really believes in a principle, and I will show you a man who will endeavor to apply that principle to every subject to which it can be applied. For instance, if a man believes in the doctrine that it is wrong to steal, he not only applies it to chickens and to horses and to money, but he applies it to every other kind of property; if the man really believes in the doctrine that it is wrong to steal, he applies the principle so as to include grand larceny as well as petty larceny.

I fear that the commandment has sometimes been amended so as to make it read "Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale." If the scale is large enough, it is a different matter. I am not violating any confidence when I tell you that it is safer to steal a million dollars than it is to steal a hundred. If a man steals a small amount, he is just a common, ordinary thief and no one has any respect for him, but a man who steals a million dollars displays so much genius that he excites admiration; his cunning and his talents are so much admired that his crime is sometimes overlooked.

If we believe that the representative is really the servant of the people and bound to carry out the will of the people, we will try to make the machinery of government conform to this principle. There is one reform of this kind in which I have been interested for years, but it has now become so popular that I can mention it without seeming radical. It is the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. When I first entered congress that question had never been acted upon. Forty years ago Andrew Johnson recommended the change in a message to congress. Back in the early 80's Gen. Weaver, then a member of congress from Iowa, introduced a resolution submitting the necessary amendment. About 1892 such a resolution passed the House of Representatives for the first time. The next congress did the same thing, and then two congresses ad-

journed without action, but the sentiment grew until finally a third, a fourth and a fifth House of Representatives submitted the resolution; twice the House was democratic and three times it was republican. If any republican, however, boasts that his party has the advantage in the number of times that the resolution has passed the House, let me say that while three republican congresses have acted favorably, they acted after the two democratic congresses had acted. I cannot, however, claim originality for the democrats because the populists advocated this reform before the democrats did. A large majority of the people of both parties are in favor of this reform, and something like two-thirds of the states have indorsed it. Why? Because among the masses there is a deep-seated belief that the representative ought to be the servant of the people, and many of the members of the United States senate do not now recognize their duty to the people.

There is another reform which has for its object the bringing of the government nearer to the people. It is what is known as the initiative and referendum. I do not know how much you have discussed the matter out here. Ten years ago we embodied in our state platform a plank demanding the initiative and referendum. An opposition paper tried to make fun of us; it said that when the plank was read at the convention the democrats looked at each other in surprise. According to this paper one democrat said "What is that?" The other replied, "Oh, that is a new kind of democratic drink," and then it was adopted unanimously. Now this is the account given by an unfriendly paper but the doctrine is better understood today. The theory underlying the initiative and referendum is that the people have a right to rule, and this reform is proposed to correct the evils which have grown up in representative government. It is not used except where it is needed. If the representative body does its duty, it will not be called into use at all, but if the legislature refuses to act upon some question upon which the people desire to act, they can bring that question before the voters by the initiative; if the legislature enacts a bad law the people can veto it through the referendum. The initia-

tive and referendum are consistent with our theory of government, because if the people want a thing, they have a right to have it. If you say that the people will make mistakes, I admit that they will, but the minority will make mistakes as well as the majority, and there is one important difference between their mistakes. The majority never intentionally make a mistake, and when they make a mistake, they correct it as soon as they find it out, but the minority sometimes find it so profitable to make mistakes at the expense of the majority that they are slow to correct them. Some of the bloodiest wars of history have been waged by the people to correct mistakes which the minority found it profitable to make. If any mistakes are to be made, let them be made by the majority and then they will be speedily corrected.

The second thought that I desire to present is this, that in all legislation, state, national and city, the great controversy is between the claims of the corporations and the rights of the individual. Eliminate the interests of the great corporations and republicans and democrats could readily agree on most questions without discussion. Take the corporations out of consideration and there would scarcely be a necessity for a roll call unless your constitution requires a roll call. In the political fights which have taken place in this country during the last quarter of a century the corporate interests usually have been on one side and the interests of the individual on the other.

Is there any difference between the individual and the corporation? Yes, a great difference. God made the individual; man made the corporation. The individual of flesh and blood was placed upon earth by the Almighty to work out a divine decree; the corporation was created to make money. Is there any difference between these two purposes? The individual is controlled by conscience; the corporation has no conscience. The individual acts upon his own responsibility and is subject to public opinion. He has the opinion of his neighbors to restrain him, but how is it with corporations? The stockholders draw their dividends but do not take part in the active management of the corporation; the

manager acts for the corporation but is the agent of someone else. The stockholders permit anything to be done that will result in dividends, and the manager acting for others, has no choice but to grind out all of the money that he can. The result is that the corporation is conducted in a manner entirely different from that in which the individual would conduct his business. I am speaking, of course, of the large corporation where the stockholders do not come into close touch with the work of the corporation.

Competition between individuals is a fairly equal competition, but when corporations are created a hundred, a thousand or a million times stronger than the God-made man, the competition between them becomes very unequal. The tendency has been to allow the corporation to do whatever it pleased no matter how large it was or how complete its monopoly. It is time for the power of the government to be used to protect the individual of flesh and blood from the encroachments from the man-made giant which we call corporation.

Some people say that we must be careful not to legislate too much. We have in our party some who are very tenacious about the doctrine that we should legislate as little as possible. One of the attorneys employed in the Standard Oil company in the recent Ohio case declared that he belonged to the old school and opposed any legislation not absolutely necessary. It will not do to create giants and then suddenly oppose restraint. If we are going to adopt the doctrine of little legislation, we should first undo the work that we have done in the creation of monopolies; after monster corporations have been created we cannot sit still and permit them to prey upon the public.

The regulation of railroads is a question which is now being discussed throughout the union. Some are afraid that the railroads may be injured by regulation; some oppose all regulation on the ground that it smacks of paternalism. Well, we have had a taste of infernalism in the management of our railway corporations, and we may well suspect the man who talks against control more than he talks against the abuses which have grown up among our railroads. Our courts have carried the

doctrine of innocent purchaser to an extreme, and they insist that the purchaser of stock in the railroad must be protected in his dividends however much water there may be in the stock, but there is another innocent purchaser whose rights will, I hope, be some day respected. He is the man who purchases land along side the railroad and whose labor makes the railroad profitable. He is entitled to consideration because he is absolutely helpless. The purchaser of stock on the market is not helpless. He does not have to buy the stock unless he wants to, and he can investigate before he buys. It is possible for him to find out how much water there is in the stock and whether the dividends are based upon actual worth, but the man who has land must use the railroad that is near him, and the fact that there is one line near him prevents another line from being built. The time is near at hand for the protection of the patron of the road as well as the stockholder. Discrimination and rebates have bankrupted individuals and communities, but extortionate rates have been even a greater detriment to the country because they have drained the earnings of the people into the treasuries of the great railroad systems.

We must have regulation and that regulation must be strict. If you present for my consideration two bills, the only question which I will ask is which goes farthest in the direction of regulation. I believe in the most complete regulation possible because I would rather trust the people to do justice to the railroads than to trust the railroad managers to do justice to the people. It is said that the railroad managers are interested in building up the country. That is true if they would take a far-sighted view of the subject, but a dividend in the hand is worth two in the bush, and they prefer to make their dividends large today rather than enlarge the equipment and provide for emergencies. They make larger profits on the capital invested by the course which they now pursue but they leave the people to suffer when an emergency arises.

I want a regulation that will regulate. My own personal opinion is that regulation will ultimately be found ineffective and that the people will be driven to the

ownership of the railroads and to the operation of them in their own interests as they have been driven to municipal ownership by the extortion and corruption of franchise-holding corporations. I believe that this is the ultimate remedy, but while regulation is desired by the people, I want it to be a regulation that will give the people as complete protection as possible.

It is evident that the rate bill passed by the last congress is not as effective as it ought to be, for the senate voted down an amendment proposed by Senator LaFollette authorizing the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the value of the railroads. How can the commission decide what is a reasonable rate without knowing what the railroads are worth? The commission should have been given authority to ascertain the present value of the railroads measured by the cost of reproduction, and as the federal commission was denied that power, the various state commissions should be given authority to ascertain the value of the roads within their states.

The control of the trusts is a state question as well as a national one. The state ought to do all in its power, but I have not deluded myself with the belief that the trust question can be entirely settled by state legislation. The time has come for the national government to exercise its powers for the extinction of private monopolies. Investigation shows that a considerable part of the abuses of corporation power is due to the duplication of directorates. A group of men obtain control of two or three or a half dozen different companies. If these companies are competitors, competition is at once stopped. If the companies are not competitors but trade with each other, the interests of one set of stockholders are sacrificed to the interests of another. For instance, two railroads come under the control of the same men, the same directors control both, the same men act as directors of both roads, and they become virtually one system, or to illustrate the other phase of the question, a railroad is organized and then the directors organize a construction company and the assets of the railroad company are turned over to the construction company. Some of the insurance companies have

been run in the same way. The directors of the company organize a bank and a trust company, and by working the three institutions in their own interests they grow rich at the expense of the stockholder and the policyholder. The old Bible doctrine that no man can serve two masters is as sound now as it was nineteen hundred years ago, and it is time to provide by law that no man who is the director of a corporation shall be eligible to election as the director of another corporation which either competes with the first one or does business with it.

Another corporate evil is to be found in the ownership of corporate stock by another corporation. Our railroad presidents are using the funds of their corporations to buy stock in other corporations and competition is being gradually extinguished. A corporation is not organized for the purpose of buying the stock of other corporations. It is organized for the transaction of a certain line of business, and it ought to be confined to that business. And while on this subject I may add that no railroad should be permitted to engage in any other business for it cannot be trusted to treat rival companies fairly when such companies come into competition with corporations controlled by the railroads.

Just a word as to municipal corporations. There has been growth in public sentiment in favor of municipal ownership. A city can do its own work better than it can let it out to corporations. In the beginning a corporation presents its plans and promises to serve the people for a reasonable compensation; as soon as it secures a franchise it begins to water its stock, and when the people try to regulate rates, the corporation resorts to the corruption of councilmen and city officials. We have frequently had the spectacle of eminently reputable men —men who stand high in society and even in the church —secretly furnishing corruption funds to buy votes and debauch councils. The public has as a matter of self-preservation been compelled to step in and undertake the work itself. The trend in this country and elsewhere is all in the direction of municipal ownership. In our state we have an illustration of the two systems. The city of Lincoln owns its waterworks while the city

of Omaha obtains water from a private corporation. While the people of Lincoln obtain their water from wells, the city furnishes water to the people at one-half the price per thousand cubic feet that is paid in Omaha, where the water is taken from the river and controlled by a private corporation. Wherever the city takes control of a municipal plant there is generally a reduction in the cost to the people, an increase of wages to the employes and reduction in the hours of labor. In England they have gone to the extent of fixing a maximum dividend when a municipal franchise is granted—that is, a corporation is not allowed to pay more than a certain dividend upon the stock. I believe that the plan is a good one and that we can well afford to adopt it wherever the people desire or prefer to grant franchises.

But no franchise should be granted except by a vote of the people, and all franchises should be for a short term and should contain a provision authorizing the city to purchase at any time at a reasonable valuation. When a corporation is asking for a franchise it figures its profits at a very low sum; when the franchise is granted, it usually capitalizes the franchise and thus admits that it has obtained a large sum of money as a gift.

I have mentioned the problems of state and city because their legislature has to deal with them, and in dealing with them the contest is always between some large corporate interest and the general public. In such cases it is difficult for the legislator to stand as an impartial arbiter between the corporation on the one side and the people on the other because the corporation is present and insistent while the people are at home.

The third subject which I desire to present is the basis of rewards. We have in this country a threatened conflict between two theories, individualism and socialism. The difference between the two is an important one. The individualist believes that society as a whole will be benefited if the individual is stimulated to the largest endeavor. The socialist believes that society will be benefited if the government takes possession of all the means of production and distribution and thus becomes the employer of a large majority of the people. This

subject is being discussed to a greater or less extent in all countries. The question is going to be settled, I take it, by a consideration of the question of rewards. What ought the reward to be? I am an individualist as contradistinguished from the socialist as socialism is defined by its exponents. I believe that wherever competition is possible we ought to have competition. The socialist believes that competition is a destructive force and that it should be eliminated. Socialism has grown because individualism has been abused and the friends of individualism owe it to themselves and to their cause to at once eradicate these abuses. Socialism will grow unless the friends of individualism step forward and by restoring competition, eliminate the evils that have grown up under monopoly. If we admit that a monopoly is a good thing, it will be difficult to answer the argument presented in favor of a government monopoly as against a private monopoly, but a monopoly is not necessary in most industries, and the aim should be to dissolve such private monopolies as now exist and prevent the creation of any new ones. The restoration of competition where competition is possible and the establishment of government ownership where competition is impossible will remove the dangers which are apprehended from socialism.

Speaking of the subject of rewards, I take occasion to express my appreciation of what the president has recently done in the education of public sentiment on this subject. He has spoken of swollen fortunes, and he has suggested not only an income tax but an inheritance tax to prevent these swollen fortunes from descending to posterity. He has performed a great service in calling attention to inequality in the distribution of wealth. It is not safe to make a prediction in regard to a man while he lives; we cannot always agree on the value of a man's services even after he is dead. I venture the opinion, however, that the president's place in history may depend not so much upon his having affixed his signature to any particular message as to the fact that he has been instrumental in turning public attention toward a great subject. He has asked the people to consider the ethics of money-making. Is there any basis upon which re-

ward can be computed? I can conceive of but one just basis and that is that the reward shall be proportionate to the contribution which one makes to the welfare of society. I can conceive of nothing which will encourage the individual more than to assure him that he will be permitted to enjoy in proportion as he adds to the enjoyment of others.

In the Holy Land I visited the valley of the Jordan and was told that the valley was as rich as the valley of the Nile. By irrigation it might be made to support a large population but the land lies untilled. Why? Because the Turkish government does not protect those who toil. The farmer does not dare to till the soil, for if he did, the Bedouin would come down from the hills at harvest time and gather in the crop. Because there is no protection for the individual there is no encouragement for the toiler.

This illustrates what has been going on to a certain extent in this country. Our people produce and consume three times as much as any similar population in the world but to an increasing degree they find themselves despoiled by those who are permitted to monopolize the opportunities of the country and the industries of the land. The Bedouins of finance swoop down upon the toiler upon the farm and in the factory and leave him less than his work entitles him to receive. I am glad that the president has called attention to what is going on and that he speaks out in favor of legislation which will discourage the accumulation of great fortunes and prevent their transmission from generation to generation, but while this would furnish a temporary remedy, the permanent remedy is to be found not in the taking of a part of the ill-gotten gains but in the withdrawal of privileges and the favoritism which have been used to pile up fortunes far in excess of the value which the possessors of these fortunes have rendered to society.

God has given us a law of rewards. He has given us the earth with its fruitful soil; He has given us the sun to shine with its warmth; He has given us the rains with their moisture, and He has said, Go work, and in proportion as you labor diligently and with intelligence, so shall your reward be. But this rule has been re-

versed. Those who perform the most important labor receive the least reward, and those who, instead of adding to the world's wealth, prey upon society, have been permitted to gather in the largest compensation. The school teacher prepares himself by years of patient study and we trust him with the training of our children who are dearer to us than our own lives, but the teacher's compensation is small if we measure it in money. The farmer produces the world's food, and the miner keeps the world warm, and the factory hand clothes the world, and yet, each draws but a small wage from society. The ordinary merchant buys what the purchaser has to sell and sells what the purchaser needs to buy; he performs an important work but his reward is small and more than ninety per cent of the merchants fail in the course of a lifetime. The professional man, the physician or the lawyer each does an important work but neither as a rule becomes a great capitalist. The minister, whose application of religion to daily life improves the morals of the community and makes both life and property more secure, he too enjoys but a small income in return for his valuable services, but the trust magnate and the manipulator of railroads—these are permitted to build up fabulous fortunes because they can control what the people must have. I thank the president for having focused public attention upon this important question, and I doubt not that his words will contribute toward a settlement that will be just.

It is our duty whether legislators or private citizens, whether acting in the state or in the larger sphere of the nation, to contribute as best we can toward such a solution of this question that each may claim such a reward as his work and worth entitle him to receive; and by securing to each such a reward we shall put hope into every heart and by encouraging each individual to do his utmost, enlarge the sum of the wealth produced and the sum of human happiness, and this wealth and this happiness will not only be larger but will be more fairly distributed than now. I thank you for your attention.

"IF UNCHECKED AND UNPUNISHED"

In its issue of February 26, the Washington, D. C., Evening Star printed under the headline "Harriman," this editorial:

"Some men think in millions, and some men act in millions. Mr. Harriman does both. His deliverances as a witness before the interstate commerce commission are worthy of study even in this day of big things and this country of captains who run them. His manner on the stand may be described in the lingo of the prize ring as smiling and confident. That he is proud of his performances is easily gathered. That he resents the official inquiry into them is more than suggested. And there you are. The Wall street philosophy to which Mr. Harriman subscribes, is, may a man not do as he pleases with his own and anybody's else which in the course of manipulation he acquires? The answer is coming, and the country awaits it with more than ordinary interest. MEANWHILE IT MAY BE MENTIONED THAT THE HARRIMAN METHODS, IF UNCHECKED AND UNPUNISHED, WOULD MAKE EXCEEDINGLY PERSUASIVE MR. BRYAN'S PROPOSITION FOR NATIONAL OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF THE GREAT TRUNK LINES OF RAILROADS."

"If unchecked and unpunished" government ownership will come! Thus saith the Washington Evening Star, which, if memory is not at fault, criticised Mr. Bryan for expressing a similar opinion in his Madison Square speech.

JOHN P. ALTGELD

The fifth anniversary of the death of John P. Altgeld occurs March 12. Memorial services will be held at the Garrick theatre Sunday, March 10, 2 o'clock p. m., under the auspices of the John P. Altgeld Memorial association, whose purpose, it is proudly asserted, is "to keep alive the inspiring memory of John P. Altgeld, volunteer soldier, jurist, statesman, publicist and humanitarian,

and to inculcate the principles of free government to which he heroically dedicated his life."

At the memorial services Daniel L. Cruice will preside. There will be an appropriate musical program, addresses will be delivered by Samuel Alschuler and Mayor Dunne, while Charles A. Towne will deliver the oration.

John P. Altgeld was at once one of the strongest and one of the gentlest of men. It is fitting that tributes should be paid to his memory not only in Chicago but in every section of his adopted country for whose welfare he was so solicitous. Governor Altgeld will be remembered, not for what others did for him, but for what he did for others. He was stricken while concluding an eloquent plea for the Boers in a speech delivered at Joliet, Ill., Mrch 11, 1902. He died as he lived—pleading the cause of the oppressed.

THE WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Democrats often complain of lack of representation among the dailies of the large cities, and they frequently make an effort to raise money by subscription to assist in starting a daily. It is becoming more and more evident that much better results can be obtained from the starting of state weeklies.

A daily in a large city is a business venture until it succeeds, and it becomes a great business enterprise if it does succeed. It requires a large plant and necessitates a large daily pay roll. As a rule, a daily paper does not succeed until some one person has secured enough stock to make it worth his while to devote his entire energy to the paper, and a man who makes a business success of a large newspaper must give his whole time and attention to it. As soon as a daily is on a paying basis it tends to become of less and less value as a party organ and as a vehicle for the spread of party doctrines. As a rule, it is edited in the counting-room rather than in the editorial department, and in most cases the owner of the paper is not the editor. A

man who has the business ability to build up a great newspaper plant generally has not the training necessary for the writing of editorials. We find, therefore, that our great dailies are becoming more and more impersonal; they have no individuality behind them—no conscience which speaks through them. The editorial writers come and go and while they stay their editorials are shaped to meet the wishes of the man or group of men in control. Some of the large dailies are owned by corporate interests that need newspaper defenders and many of the dailies are so connected with exploiting enterprises as to be worse than useless as exponents of public opinion. It is not unusual for all of the newspapers of a city to rally about some franchise holding company when it seeks further privileges, and yet the corporation candidate may be defeated in an election by one who has no newspaper support.

So much for the daily. Because of the waning influence of its editorial page it is likely to become more and more a mere newspaper, appealing for patronage to the members of all parties and relying upon its advertising for its profits.

If the democrats of a state need an organ, let them establish a weekly at the capital of the state or at some other distributing center. If there is already established a newspaper which is ably edited and which devotes its attention to state and national politics, it may be easier to convert this paper into a state organ than to establish a new one. Let the paper be known as the state organ of the party and let the state committee use it for the spread of such information as needs to be presented to the voters. Money put into a weekly will enable the party leaders to reach a great many more voters than could be reached by the same amount invested in a daily, and the weekly is read more carefully than the daily.

The editor of a weekly is known; his character stands back of his writings and is a pledge for the truth of what he says. The weekly is likely to grow in political influence for it is the only paper that can be owned and edited by the same man. The editor is close to the people and not only knows their necessities, but cannot

afford to betray his readers into the hands of predatory wealth. His advertisers, too, are not the kind that attempt to control the policy of the paper.

We ought to have a democratic weekly of state circulation in every state. The state weekly will not only not interfere with the local weeklies but it ought to work in harmony with them. Newspaper literature is the cheapest there is, and as nearly every voter takes several papers there is no reason why he should not take a weekly giving the news of the community and discussing local issues, and in addition subscribe for a state weekly which will defend his interests in all matters of state importance. The Commoner cannot cover the ground of the state weekly because it is a national rather than a state paper and its columns are devoted to the discussion of questions of national importance. It will co-operate with the state weeklies and the local weeklies, for each has a sphere of its own and all can work together for the promulgation of democratic principles, for the advancement of democratic policies and for the preservation of a government "of the people, by the people and for the people."

The democrats of each state are urged to consider the question of establishing a weekly democratic paper, and the sooner the work is commenced the better. We ought to have these papers now to lay the groundwork for the coming campaign.

RAILROAD MANAGEMENT

The argument against the government ownership of railroads has been that the roads can be managed more wisely by private individuals controlled by their private interests. If this argument fails, who will be able to defend private ownership, and yet, during the last few months the public has been forced to the consideration of the question: Do the railroad managers manage wisely? The coal famine has brought great suffering in different sections, and the people say: Why are the railroads unable to furnish coal to the people who need

coal? There has been car shortage, grain has waited in the elevators for transportation and merchandise has stood for weeks upon the sidetracks, and the people ask, Why is it that the managers do not provide transportation facilities? Is it a shortage of cars or a shortage of motive power, or both, and if a shortage, why? Has money been spent in dividends that ought to have been spent in equipment? Will the railroads seriously affirm that they are under no obligation to move merchandise when the holders of the merchandise want it moved? Will the railroads accommodate the people or must the people accommodate themselves to the railroads? Are the railroads built for the people or do people live for the purpose of earning dividends for the railroads?

And what about watered stock? Are the people not to be considered in the capitalization of the railroads? Whenever the dividends of a railroad get high enough to attract attention, the stock is watered so that the earnings can be spread over a larger capitalization, and then the managers get to work to raise the dividends again. This is an endless chain, and it continues to draw money out of the pockets of the people and carry it to the pockets of the railroad managers. Is there no limit to the amount of extortion that can be practiced? Every time the authorities attempt to reduce railroad rates, whether passenger or freight, a cry goes up from the railroad managers but every protest that is made against reasonable reductions helps to open the eyes of the public to the selfishness that characterizes railroad management. Competition is being throttled, small roads are being forced into great combinations, and the manipulators of the railroads are piling up their fortunes by juggling with railroad securities.

An important question arises, namely: Can railroad management be made honest while it remains in private hands? The railroad managers are doing their best to force the people to answer, No. Will the railroads regard themselves as common carriers and undertake to perform their duty in a reasonable way and for a reasonable compensation? The railroad managers are not yet prepared to answer, Yes.

If the people are driven reluctantly to seek in public

ownership a remedy for the evils of private management, the blame will not be upon the reformer but upon the railroad manager. While the reformer is trying to make private ownership tolerable by reasonable regulation, the railroad magnate is defying public sentiment, disregarding public interests and continuing the exploitation of those who are forced to use the roads.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The North American Review of January has a very strong article in favor of Philippine independence by Judge James H. Blount of Georgia.

Judge Blount was a captain in the Spanish war serving both in Cuba and the Philippines and was for four years a judge in the Philippine Islands.

He asserts what every one ought to know by this time, that the Filipinos almost without exception desire independence, and he points out the difficulties which have attended American rule and the evils resulting therefrom.

One of the most striking parts of his article is the reproduction of a court order dismissing cases against a hundred and twenty prisoners all but one of whom had died in jail within seven months. He cites the high duty put upon cotton, the main clothing of the Filipinos, and the sacrifice of the Filipinos to the interests of the sugar and tobacco trusts.

Judge Blount believes that independence should not only be promised at once but that ten years should be fixed as the time which should elapse before granting independence. He also favors the neutralization of the islands by treaty.

Judge Blount's article is a valuable addition to the literature on the Philippine question. Neutralization is not only desirable but possible. Whether a time should be fixed for independence or the time left indefinite is a matter upon which the friends of Philippine independence will differ. But as they all agree that a promise should be made now and that independence should be

permitted as soon as a stable government can be established, the fixing of the time is of minor importance.

If the cause would be strengthened by fixing a date, it ought to be fixed, otherwise it is better to leave it indefinite and this question can only be determined by those who desire to see independence an accomplished fact.

PANIC

The railroad speculators have been very busy of late predicting a panic and they say that the people will not invest in railroad stocks because of the "onslaught" against the railroads. If the investing public is alarmed, it is because the railroad managers have exaggerated the effect of rate reductions in a vain effort to terrorize the legislatures, and they have only themselves to blame if they have carried matters too far. If any other explanation is needed for the hesitancy on the part of investors, the investigations furnish it, for the inquiries have shown to what extent railroad stocks have been watered. But what is the alternative? Must the government refuse to investigate rotten management for fear the mismanaged railroads no longer will be able to fool the public into buying inflated securities? The sooner the railroads are put on an honest basis the more secure will the investing public feel. A peculiarly interesting phase of the present situation is that the railroad managers are now clamoring for federal regulation as a substitute for state regulation, and this clamor answers the arguments recently advanced by the advocates of centralization. The latter have been asserting that the federal government is the only competent regulator of interstate corporations and that the predatory wealth of the country is shielding itself behind state legislation. The fact is that all of the great corporations would rather risk congressional legislation than state legislation because the state legislatures are closer to the people, and more clearly voice the sentiments of the people.

A great deal of noise has been made and a great deal has been said about regulating the big interstate mo-

nopolies, but little has been accomplished except to educate the people as a whole to the evils of the trust system. Very few of the big trusts have been interfered with. None of the trust magnates have yet been sent to jail. The laws against the trusts should be either repealed or enforced. The government cannot afford to retain useless statutes on its books, which are violated flagrantly every day. When this is done it breeds disrespect for the law, which all good Americans should uphold in every way possible. Laws which can be laughed at by the monopolists of a country are a detriment, rather than a source of strength to a nation. The government cannot afford to shield the big violators of the laws and punish only the petty thieves.

CLINTON BABBITT

Clinton Babbitt died suddenly March 11, at his home in Beloit, Wisconsin. In chronicling Mr. Babbitt's death the Beloit Daily News refers to him as the "last surviving member of the first common council of the city of Beloit, ex-congressman from the First district, ex-secretary of the state agricultural society, ex-postmaster, and friend to everybody."

Mr. Babbitt was a personal friend of the editor of The Commoner and The Commoner heartily endorses the beautiful tribute paid by the editor of the Beloit Daily News when he said: "Clinton Babbitt is dead. He blessed the times in which he lived. He was a simple man, unpretentious, lovable and loving. He grappled with no abstruse problems, he did not force radical opinions upon others. His was a kindly nature and considerate and the world—artificial as it is—loves to honor such a man. Mr. Babbitt had his struggles and his sorrows and bore them philosophically and all the time he helped his fellows to bear their burdens. Like Henry George he recognized 'that the true law of social life is the law of love, and law of liberty, the law of each for all and all for each.' Few men die more mourned by a community than is Clinton Babbitt. His monument is erected in men's hearts. To die thus is to die great."

MONARCHY SUGGESTED

The Chicago Record-Herald in collecting views upon a third term for Mr. Roosevelt drew the following from Richard Mansfield, the actor:

"Benjamin Harrison said to me: 'I am just beginning to learn now when I have to leave.' I am most heartily in favor of a third term, and for the matter of that, of a fourth term for President Roosevelt. I do not see how any fair-minded or honest citizen can be of any other opinion. I am furthermore in favor of a constitutional monarchy for this country."

President Roosevelt's friends will not thank Mr. Mansfield for this blunt disclosure of the dangers which lie but half concealed in the perpetual presidency movement. For more than a century the precedent set by Washington and Jefferson has been observed, and the one man who aspired to a third was defeated for the nomination notwithstanding the fact that he was the successful general in the world's greatest civil war, and made an effort to secure the third nomination when most of his comrades in arms still survived. Not only has public sentiment opposed the third term but three presidents—Jackson, Hayes and Cleveland—have presented arguments against a second term, pointing out the perils involved in the use of presidential patronage to advance personal ambition. President Roosevelt himself recognized the force and wisdom of the precedent when on the night of the election he announced that he regarded this as his second term and would not be a candidate again. He is not likely to be moved from his position by such appeals as are now made to him. He knows that his renomination would turn public attention away from the economic questions in which he is interested to the consideration of a governmental question supposed to be settled. If the issue thus raised was decided against him the enthusiasm of his friends could not save him from mortification; if it was decided in his favor he could not rid himself of the fear that some less scrupulous successor might use his example to establish himself permanently in the office.

Has the republican party but one man available for

the presidency? If the president has done so well as to deserve a third term it is strange that he has not developed at least one co-laborer to presidential size.

Is his nomination necessary to save the republican party from defeat? Why should he be so solicitous about the party when its leaders have refused to assist him to carry out the reforms which he has advocated? Will he sacrifice himself in order to defeat the democratic party? Why should he so dislike the democrats? Has he not won his popularity by adopting their ideas? And has he not received more loyal support from the democrats in the senate and house than from the republicans? And is it to save his country that he is urged to run? The democrats, if successful will inaugurate several reforms which he has tried to inaugurate but which the democrats were advocating before he ever spoke in their behalf? The believers in constitutional monarchy and the advocates of a continuous performance in the White House cannot advance any arguments that will appeal to the president's ambition—which has been abundantly satisfied—or to his love of party or to his devotion to country, but the discussion may reveal that we still have a few people in the country who prefer a life-term to the agitation involved in quadrennial elections.

STATE VS. NATION

The discussion of railroad regulation is furnishing a conclusive answer to the charge that the "states rights" doctrine is a cover for the friends of predatory wealth. The federal congress after great effort passed a bill that stopped rebates and enabled the railroads to keep what they had formerly returned in the way of rebates to favored shippers. The railroads weakened the bill as much as possible and no one knows yet how valuable or valueless the measure will prove. But the state legislatures went to work to lower rates. A number of legislatures enacted two-cent fare laws and some reduced freight rates. The railroads instead of accepting these laws loudly proclaimed that they would ruin the

roads and now as a result—not of the laws but of the wild language of the railroad managers—the roads find it difficult to obtain loans for improvements. And what is the result? They want all regulation exercised by the general government because the states annoy them and scare the public.

No wonder the railroads want to get away from state legislatures. The state legislatures are near to the people and quickly respond to public sentiment, while the national congress is more remote and harder to reach. But the people will not have to consent to any proposition which weakens their control of the highways of commerce. Events are strengthening the democratic position and the news items published support the doctrine that the states should be protected in the enjoyment of all the authority reserved to them by the constitution.

AS CLEAR AS—MUD

The press dispaches bring us the news that, speaking before the Indiana legislature, Vice-President Fairbanks delivered the following oracular utterance:

"In recent years there has been a tendency to combinations of capital to carry forward the work of our industrial developments. We have enacted, and will continue to enact, such laws as will safeguard HONEST industry and WHOLESOME enterprise. We will keep open the avenues to free and JUST competition, but we will restrain within appropriate limits those agencies or combinations which may seek to disregard FAIR laws of trade and competition and to override the interests of the body of the people. Capital which is PROPERLY employed will be properly protected, and that which is not so engaged must fall under the SHARP condemnation of the law."

The vice-president is more specific than usual, yet it will be noticed that in this brief statement he uses six words that can be construed to mean anything or noth-

ing. The genial vice-president is a close imitator of the man of whom it was said "he just didn't exactly say what he did talk about."

RUSSIAN REFORM

It is good news that comes from Russia. The Czar, through Premier Stolypin, informs the Duma that he will propose measures guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, habeas corpus, abolition of administrative exile and popular education.

"Our country," he says, "must be transformed into a constitutional state. Real measures must be adopted to define and determine the rights of the state and of private individuals, and to abolish the contradictions between the old and new laws and the arbitrary interpretations placed upon them by private persons as well as by officials. The government, therefore, has decided that it is necessary to submit a series of bills establishing the new regime in Russia."

The Minister of Justice is to propose bills "patterned on the procedure of civil and criminal law in other European states, and the government promises to insure full liberty of action both to employers and their workmen, including freedom in matters of economic strikes." The government also plans workmen's insurance and medical relief and measures prohibiting night and underground work for women and children, as well as shorter hours. Surely a brighter day is dawning for Russia and her well-wishers will rejoice that these great reforms are coming without revolution. It will take time to transplant in that country the constitutional liberty so long enjoyed throughout Europe, but people are apt to be patient when they are assured of ultimate relief. Reforms have been delayed so long that some may doubt the Czar's good intentions, but distrust will give place to confidence if the promised measures are

presented. With freedom to speak and write the reformers can hope to remove abuses, and with freedom of conscience and universal education Russia will take her place among the great nations of the world. Here's to "the bear that walks like a man."

REAL INFIDELITY

The Chicago Inter-Ocean in an editorial endorsing Germany's refusal to consent to a limitation of armaments and characterizing as "hypocritical humanitarianism" England's offer to join in the discouragement of larger navies says:

"Peace in the world is secured by predominant force, and a gentlemen's agreement among nations has no guaranty except mutual respect for one another's force. There was once a 'pax Romanus' and there has been talk of a 'pax Britannica;' but such a universal peace is kept by the sword, not by Hague agreements, just as international respect for our Monroe doctrine is secured not by the voluntary consent of nations, but by fear of the power of these United States."

This is infidelity to the fundamental principle upon which our civilization rests. It overlooks the influence of Christianity, the power of truth and the strength of the sense of justice which is to be found in every human heart. The Inter-Ocean would seem to build upon the basis of brute strength, but it is probably not so degraded as its argument would indicate. More likely it is deluded by the builders of war ships who play one nation against another for the money to be made in the sale of ships. There is no end to such a rivalry but the bankruptcy of the rivals. Even our nation has been caught by the argument that peace can be promoted by cultivating a spirit of war, but in time a wise counsel will prevail.

THINGS "ULTIMATE" AND THINGS "IMMEDIATE"

In its issue of March 16, the New York World printed an editorial entitled "Ultimate Ownership." For the benefit of Commoner readers who do not read the World, this editorial is printed in full. It reads:

"Mr. Bryan finds as much virtue in 'ultimate' as Touchstone found in 'if.' He assures the reporters that he has not changed his views on the railroad question since his Madison Square Garden speech, in which he said he 'had reached the conclusion that the ultimate solution would be found in government ownership.' Any misunderstanding of Mr. Bryan's position was due to the fact that 'unfriendly papers lost sight of the word "ultimate" and discussed it as an immediate question.'

"But why so much insistence on 'ultimate?' If existing conditions are intolerable and there is no remedy under constitutional government as it has been administered in this country for 118 years, why procrastinate? Why talk about 'ultimate' solutions when we can have an immediate solution? Surely the present generation, sinful though it may be, has certain rights in the way of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and there is little sense in saving all the good things for posterity. Posterity may not be worthy of them.

"To quibble about 'ultimate' is beneath the dignity of a conservative, constructive statesman like Mr. Bryan. If the government must buy the property of its Harrimans, its Hills and its Morgans whenever these gentlemen do not behave, the sooner the policy is inaugurated the better. The longer it is deferred the more mischief will be done and the worse off we shall be. If there is no longer any virtue in organized government to set up standards of financial conduct and punish those who transgress, the longer we continue on the present tack the further we shall sail out of the course. Human nature is not going to change in five years or ten years or fifty years. Society will always have Harrimans, Hills and Morgans.

"If Mr. Bryan believes in government ownership at all he should demand immediate government ownership.

But does he really believe in government ownership, now that he has found it unpopular? Perhaps he does, but we have observed that all the stand-patters talk about an 'ultimate' revision of the tariff, and that in their case Mr. Bryan says it means they are not in favor of revision at all. Possibly the rule does not work both ways. And possibly, too, Mr. Bryan has discovered that by being 'ultimately' in favor of something or other a candidate can hedge either way."

"ULTIMATE OWNERSHIP"

It will be observed that the New York World takes offense at the word "ultimate" and insists that "if Mr. Bryan believes in government ownership at all he should demand immediate government ownership." "To quibble about 'ultimate' is beneath the dignity of a conservative, constructive statesman like Mr. Bryan," it says, and asks: "Why talk about ultimate solutions when we can have an immediate solution?"

The World is not speaking with its usual intelligence when it insists that we must have every good thing at once or not at all. In 1896 it favored tariff reform and an income tax, and yet it was willing to postpone these things and urge the election of a high protectionist, and an opponent of the income tax because there was an immediate question upon which it agreed with the republican party. It did not insist upon immediate tariff reform, and yet the World might have asked itself: "If the World believes in tariff reform at all why should it not demand immediate tariff reform?" It is neither kind nor just in the World to ask: "But does he really believe in government ownership, now that he has found it unpopular?" It has reason enough to know that Mr. Bryan's views upon a question do not depend upon the popularity of those views. He advocated tariff reform when it was not as popular as it is now; he advocated an income tax in 1890, four years before the democrats embodied the idea in a revenue measure; he advocated

the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people two years before congress ever acted favorably on the proposition; he opposed imperialism as early as June, 1898, before it was possible to ascertain the sentiment of the people, and he spoke in favor of bimetallism when the democratic administration, not to speak of the World, opposed it. Mr. Bryan even questioned the wisdom of nominating Judge Parker when the World and the Eagle were fighting over the front seat on the Parker band wagon. The difference between the "immediate" and the "ultimate" in politics is so clear that even the editor of the World could see it if he would. Jefferson believed in emancipation as an ultimate solution of the slavery question but he did not insist upon immediate emancipation. Lincoln also opposed slavery as a system but he expressly denied that he favored immediate emancipation. It is the part of wisdom to look ahead but it is not the part of wisdom to insist upon the doing of anything before the people are ready for it. Mr. Bryan said on August 30 last that he regarded government ownership as the "ultimate" solution of the railroad question, but he was careful to say that he did not know that the country was ready for it or that a majority of the democrats favored it. Mr. Bryan has no desire to force government ownership upon the country, and he would be powerless to force government ownership upon the country against the will of the people even if he desired to do so. According to the World's logic no one should see the wisdom of any reform until a majority of the people see it, or if he does see it he should not mention it.

The railroad managers are constantly increasing the number of advocates of government ownership by their exploitation of the public and by their opposition to regulation, but while this educational work is going on there are several reforms upon which the people are already prepared to act, and the World will not be permitted to turn attention away from these immediate questions by its frantic efforts to confuse the public mind. We will point out tendencies as we see them, Mr. Editor, but we will settle questions as we reach them. It is not necessary to shut one's eyes to the future in order to deal

with the present. Neither is it necessary to abandon one's views of things ultimate in order to act upon things immediate.

WHAT THEY WANT

The Chicago Tribune, after printing interviews with the presidents of eleven railroads, summarizes what these railroad magnates want as follows:

"Repeal of the Sherman anti-trust law, so far as it applies to railroads and forbids combinations, which are as much in the interests of the general public as of any individuals; national regulation, removing railroads from state control so far as necessary for protection against vicious and unintelligent legislation; a recognition of the fact that prosperity of the railroads is necessary for the extensions which the growth of the country makes indispensable; a spirit of fair play, a better understanding, and a pull all together for a greater and more prosperous country."

The first demand means that the railroads be given the right to pool. It will be remembered that in his message to congress Mr. Roosevelt recommended that the railroads be given this right. Upon that point, then, the railroads and Mr. Roosevelt were at agreement. But at the time the rate regulation bill was passed the railroads bitterly fought federal regulation. There the railroads and Mr. Roosevelt were not at agreement. Now, however, the railroads and Mr. Roosevelt agree, first upon the pooling proposition, and second, upon the plan to lodge all control over the railroads in the federal government. Upon one point at least the railroad magnates have changed front. Where but a year ago they were bitterly opposed to federal regulation they are now enthusiastically in favor of federal regulation.

One need not look far for an explanation. The power of the state government in the protection of the public interests has recently been demonstrated. It is not "vicious and unintelligent legislation" which the railroad magnates fear on the part of state governments. They fear legislation that results in practical benefits

to the people. They fear laws which require from the railroad magnate justice to his patrons. So far as concerns other portions of the Tribune's statement, they are balderdash. Of course every one recognizes that the railroad ought to be prosperous and the men who insist upon railroad regulation believe in "a spirit of fair play, a better understanding, and a pull all together for a greater and more prosperous country."

The Harrimans, however, do not believe in the spirit of fair play. They do not want the people to have any understanding of the railroad speculator's method. And instead of "a pull all together for a greater and more prosperous country," they want the public to be the servant rather than the master of the corporation, and they want the men and women of America, for whose use and benefit the corporation was created and for whose use and benefit the public highways were loaned for a time to the corporations' agents—to "pull all together" for the benefit of the Harrimans of today and the creation of a greater and greedier Harriman in the days to come.

GENERAL LEE'S EXAMPLE

Grover Cleveland has written to the Tennessee legislature what is called "a warning against radical insurance legislation." Mr. Cleveland's advice on this subject would have more weight from the disinterested standpoint were it not for the fact tht he is an employe of the great insurance companies from whose exactions the authorities of Tennessee and those of other states are trying to protect the people. And this recalls the interesting and instructive letter written in 1868 by General Robert E. Lee, at a time when General Lee needed money badly. He was offered a position at the head of an insurance company. His reply to the offer was what Thomas E. Watson well calls "a sermon on standards of taste and public service," and was as follows:

"Lexington, Va., December 23, 1868.—Dear Mr. B—: I am very much obliged to you for your letter of the 12th

and the kind interest you have shown in my welfare. I approve highly of your views, and especially of your course, and feel satisfied that you will accomplish great good. I have considered Mr. F—'s proposition, and though I believe that the southern business in the present condition of our affairs would be attended with great trouble, and should be managed with great care; in my present position I fear I should not have time, even if I possessed the ability, to conduct it. Life insurance trusts I consider sacred. To hazard the property of the dead, and to lose the scanty earnings of fathers and husbands who have toiled and saved that they may leave something to their families, deprived of their care and the support of their labor, is to my mind the worst of crimes. I could not undertake such a charge unless I could see and feel that I could faithfully execute it. I have therefore felt constrained, after deliberation, to decline the proposition of Mr. F—. I trust that the company may select some better man for the position, for I think in proper hands it would accomplish good. For your interest in my behalf, and for Mr. L—'s kind consideration, I am very grateful. And with my thanks to both of you, and to Mr. F— for his kindness, to whom I trust you to explain the reason of my course, I am, truly yours, "R. E. LEE."

SAVING HIS FACE

"Mr. Harriman," says the Cleveland Plain Dealer, "left the White House with a smile on his face." Surely our esteemed contemporary did not expect him to leave with a patch of court plaster on it?—Washington Post.

A smile on "his face?" Isn't that the place for a smile? Besides, he couldn't have deposited that smile in the White House when he left. Mr. Roosevelt has no use for it.—New York Herald.

Perhaps, as the Chinese say, he was trying to "save his face."

THE DEMANDS OF LABOR

The Wall Street Journal, taking cognizance of the general disposition on the part of labor to demand an increased share of the prosperity so often boasted about, says:

"That labor is disposed to push to further limits the advantage which it has gained in the recent past is more or less certain. But the condition of the money market, the state of affairs in the railway world, and the retrenchments which are under way in various directions, are likely to cause a halt in the granting of advances in wages, or the increasing of expenses in any of the leading items of outlay. The world of labor and its leaders would do well to take into account the fact that a change has come over the field of employment since the beginning of the current calendar year. Readjustment is necessary in financial, industrial, and commercial lines, before any new burdens of any considerable moment can be assumed by those who are responsible for the management of these enterprises. If therefore the temper of labor is to force the issue of advanced wages it may find that the public, which is always in a position to throw its influence one way or another, will rather be with the employer than with the employe at a time when our prosperity demands patience, critical foresight, and the highest degree of co-operation."

Is it wrong, or calculated to disturb business interests, for the wage earners of the country to demand an increased share in the boundless properity that has been enjoyed by the Harrimans, the Hills, the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Ryans and the whole run of insurance magnates? Mr. Harriman pays $40,000,000 for a railroad, issues $100,000,000 in bonds to raise money for improvements never made. Then as an individual he buys from himself as manager of the railroad these same bonds at 65 cents on the dollar, and then, as representative of a big financial combine buys as an investment for his company those same bonds from himself as an individual at 95 cents on the dollar. That is "good business," but when the employe of the looted railroad asks for an advance in wage to meet the higher cost of

living, that employe is notified that he must go slow because "readjustment is necessary in financial, commercial and industrial lines."

Mr. Hill as owner of the Northern Pacific issues enough stock to buy the Burlington railroad, guaranteeing to pay dividends on the stock at double its original value. Then he proceeds to charge rates high enough to pay dividends on this watered stock, giving the investors, himself the largest, double interest on their original investment. But when the employes of the Hill railroads ask for an increased wage in order to meet the increased expenses of a mere livelihood, the Wall Street Journal and kindred organs notify the employe that he should not make such a demand at this time when "readjustment is necessary in financial, commercial and industrial lines."

Mr. Rockefeller, who has accumulated wealth beyond the dreams of avarice, announces through the public press that he has given $30,000,000 to the cause of education—a gift so princely in its size that the human mind can scarcely grasp it—and the great journals of the day vie with one another in commending the spirit of philanthropy which prompted the gift. But when the employes of the Standard Oil company and other corporations owned and controlled by the oil octupus, ask for an increased wage that they may meet the increased expense of living and not be forced to depend upon the charity of men grown rich from their toil, they are told that they must be careful; that they must not insist upon an increase just now, when "readjustment is necessary in financial, commercial and industrial lines."

In this matter of "readjustment" the workingman who has nothing but the wage he has earned insists that he be recognized. The trouble with former "readjustments" has been that the readjusters have got the money while the workingman has got nothing but good advice and promises. He has grown tired of a stationary wage while the corporations employing him have been making from 100 to 1,000 per cent on their investments. Knowing that without him the corporations would be helpless, he feels that he is entirely within the bounds of reason when he asks a paltry wage increase of 10 or 15 per cent,

and he is not likely to be satisfied with any talk about the necessity of "readjustment in financial, commercial and industrial lines."

"CORNFIELD LAWYERS"

The New York Tribune indulges in a few slurs that are unworthy of a paper whose proprietor holds a high official position. It would not be fair to hold Ambassador Reid accountable for what a snobbish editorial employe says, but it is strange any editor with brains enough to secure employment should so forget the courtesy due from the Tribune to the men intrusted by their constituents with the important work of framing a state constitution. The Tribune says that "the Oklahoma convention was full of 'cornfield lawyers,'" and as if it was intoxicated by the sound of the phrase it repeats it saying: "The 'cornfield' jurists thought it wiser on the whole to wait until the state was organized and exploit their nostrums in the halls of the state legislature." The whole editorial is written in flippant vein and reveals the contempt in which the editor holds these men chosen by the people of the new state to frame their organic law. The editor does not know what the constitution contains; that, he admits, "will be disclosed only when the full text reaches the public," but he does not have to see the constitution to be convinced that "cornfield lawyers" are not likely to do anything wise.

It is unfortunate that an eastern paper should be in the control of a man so prejudiced against the west. That there is no ground for such prejudice goes without saying. Oklahoma was settled up by as intelligent and patriotic a class of people as can be found in the union. No state has brighter prospects and there is every reason to believe that the constitution is drawn in accordance with the wishes of the citizens.

If the Oklahoma convention had been filled with Depews and Platts the Tribune's editor would be gushing over their statesmanship, but as the delegates owe their places to the farmers rather than to the railroads

they are dubbed "cornfield lawyers." How long will the country lawyers, the village physicians and the cross-road storekeepers continue to take their political instruction from men whose ears, like the ears of the Tribune's editor, are trained to catch the slightest pulsations of a pocketbook? How long will the "cornfield lawyers" follow the lead of the trust-fed attorneys and the corporation controlled editors?

GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Chicago, Ill., March 25, 1907.—Hon. Henry M. Whitney, 247 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass.—My Dear Sir: I am in receipt of your letter as follows: "As you are known to be an advocate of regulation of railroads, both by the national and state governments, and as you have also announced it as your belief that government ownership furnishes the ultimate solution of the railroad question, I write to ask you whether in your judgment there is any danger that regulation will be carried to the point of preventing a reasonable return on money invested in the railroads of the country, and whether in case of the adoption of government ownership by the nation or by the several states the stockholders could expect to receive a price equal to the value of the physical railroad properties?"

In reply would say that I am in favor of both national and state regulations, and that I also believe that public ownership is the ultimate solution of the railroad question. In my discussions on this subject I have pointed out that because of the danger of centralization in ownership by the federal government of all the lines, I prefer a system in which the federal government will be confined to the necessary trunk lines, and the ownership of the rest of the lines be left to the states. This, however, is not an immediate question; at least I am not sure that the people are ready to consider the question of public ownership, and until they are ready to consider that question the interest is centered in regulation. As an advocate of regulation of the strictest

sort, I can say to you that there is no danger whatever that this regulation will be carried to the point of preventing a reasonable return on money invested in the railroads of the country. And I can also assure you that whenever public ownership is adopted by the states or by the nation, the stockholders may expect to receive a price at least equal to the value of the physical properties of the road; but no such assurance ought to be necessary for two reasons: First, because the public has shown no disposition to reduce railroad earnings to a point which would deny a reasonable return. There is a sense of justice in the public that can be appealed to and that sense of justice will prevent legislation which is unfair. It is not necessary for the railroads to bribe legislators either with passes or with other favors to protect themselves against legislation if the railroads are satisfied with a reasonble return. The trouble is that the railroads have watered the stock and have compelled the public to pay dividends and interest upon fictitious capitalization. This is resented by the public, and very properly so, but their resentment will not be carried to the point of doing injustice to the owners of stock.

When, however, we come to consider the question of investment there may be a difference of opinion as to what is just. I have contended that the present value of the railroad should be ascertained by the interstate commerce commission and the commissions of the various states, in order that investors may know when they are buying stock of intrinsic value and when they are being cheated. As long as promoters are permitted to issue stock that does not represent real value there must be fluctuation in the stock market, for every disclosure of bad railroad management necessarily affects the value of stock. The stockholders, therefore, who desire to purchase for legitimate investment, should have as much interest as the patrons in reducing the railroad business to an honest basis, but the railroads have thus far prevented the passage of a law authorizing the interstate commerce commission to fix the value of the roads.

When the value of the roads is ascertained, I am sat-

isfied that public sentiment will insist that the returns shall be sufficient to pay a reasonable dividend upon the money invested. What this dividend should be it might be difficult to fix arbitrarily. I believe the statutes of Massachusetts and Connecticut fix a minimum dividend, but as these laws were passed some years ago when interest rates were higher, the rates fixed are probably too high at this time. I should say that any maximum rate fixed by the people should be a little higher than the rate fixed by competition in the purchase of stock. If, for instance, stock which pays a four per cent dividend can be sold at par, a maximum dividend ought to be enough above that to provide for possible fluctuations in business. If it requires a five per cent dividend to make stock sell at par, then the maximum dividend contemplated by legislation should be above five per cent, or say six per cent.

In case the various states or the nation decide to enter upon public ownership of the roads, there would be no disposition to confiscate the property. I am satisfied that in the purchase of roads the public would be much more apt to pay more than the roads are worth than less. There is, therefore, no reason why a person having money to invest in railroads should not be willing to invest upon an honest basis at this time, for no future legislation would deny him a fair return. But there is another reason why investors need not fear. They are not only protected by the sense of justice in the people themselves, but they are still further protected by the courts which will not permit legislation that is confiscatory. Several of the railroad presidents have recently complained of state legislation and charged that the legislation would not permit the railroads to earn a reasonable profit. The investing public has been unnecessarily alarmed by these statements. The railroad presidents, instead of attempting to terrorize the legislature, should have announced to investors that if the legislators attempted to cut down railroad earnings below a reasonable point, the courts would restrain them. No railroad regulation will be sustained by the courts that does injustice to the owners of the railroad, and if public ownership is entered

upon, the government cannot take the roads without paying what the roads are worth. This is a judicial question. In order to obtain a railroad now in existence, the government would either have to buy it or condemn it. If it bought, it would have to buy upon the price agreed upon. If it condemned it, it would have to pay the price fixed by the court. It will be seen, therefore, that all this cry about confiscation is without foundation.

I think I can speak for those who believe in regulation and I know that there is not and never has been danger of injustice to the owners of the railroad, and if I can speak for those who believe that the ultimate solution of the question is to be found in public ownership, I can say that there is no disposition to confiscate railroad property even if the courts would permit it.

In arguing the Nebraska maximum rate case before the supreme court of the United States, I took the position that the value of the road to be recognized in the fixing of rates should be the cost of reproduction. You will find my brief quoted in full in the decision. While the court did not clearly lay down a rule on that subject, I am still of the opinion that there is no just basis for measuring the value of railroads except the cost of reproduction, that being the basis upon which all other industries must rest. A farmer's land is worth not what it may have cost him, or what he may have spent upon it, but what an adjoining farm can be bought for in the open market. A merchant's stock is not worth what it cost him, but what it can be replaced for at present prices. The rules that apply to the mass of mankind and to ordinary business in the fixing of values ought to apply to the railroads, for when we allow one class to exempt itself from the general rule it not only avoids contingencies which the rest must meet, but by the avoiding of these contingencies it throws an additional burden upon all other forms of industries.

Pardon this lengthy reply, but I am very glad to answer your questions and to tell you that honest investors in honestly conducted railroads have nothing to fear. The sooner the honestly conducted railroads separate themselves from the dishonestly conducted ones, the safer they will be, and the sooner the honest investor sep-

arates himself from the speculator the safer he will be. Honest accumulations and honest investors have too long borne the odium that predatory wealth should bear alone. A line should be drawn among railroad managers and investors in railroad property, between those, on the one hand, who do a legitimate business and supply a public need, and those, on the other hand, who have the instincts of a bird of prey and make victims of all who are helpless and defenseless. Yours truly,

W. J. BRYAN.

MYSTERIES

"A young democrat" writes to the New York World to say: "If my memory serves me right, you found fault with Mr. Bryan in 1900 because he insisted on the democratic platform being drawn to meet his views. In the matter of government ownership of railroads he does not appear so insistent in forcing his ideas on the people or his party. He states that he does not know if the same are acceptable or not, but that he believes the 'ultimate' result will be government ownership. In your editorial of the 16th you intimate that the term 'ultimate' was used to enable the candidate to 'hedge either way.' Now, then, to a regular reader of your valuable paper it appears that Mr. Bryan is 'damned if he does and damned if he does not.'"

The World will have no more difficulty in explaining this than it will have in explaining its peculiar position on the railroad question generally. It denounces the government ownership proposition with the same vigor it employed in fighting railway rate legislation. Opposed alike to government ownership and government control it has never yet taken its readers into its confidence sufficiently to tell where it really does stand. The World's position on the railroad question has puzzled some of its best friends.

AT THE GRAVE OF GOV. HOGG

Austin, March 29.—(Special to Fort Worth Record.) —Standing uncovered by the gray granite shaft that marks the spot where the great commoner of Texas sleeps that last sleep that comes to mortals, the great commoner of the nation pronounced these words in eulogy:

"Truly he was a great and good man," and then he laid his tribute of flowers upon the grave.

The visit of William Jennings Bryan to the grave of James Stephen Hogg was a feature of the visit of the great national character to Austin that was full of human interest and touched every emotion of the human heart. It was a quiet, unostentatious tribute of a friend living to a friend dead. It was brought about by Mr. Bryan's own request—and the first request he made after reaching Austin, and it was unaccompanied by a crowd of sightseers or curious people. Only Mr. Bryan and those who, by official designation, are his hosts on this occasion, were present, and the visit to the quiet city of the dead was but a short one.

Mr. Bryan expressed to Judge James H. Robertson his desire to visit the grave of former Governor Hogg, and it was arranged that when the party left the mansion to go to the university that the drive should be through the cemetery.

Mr. Bryan was accompanied by Governor Campbell, Lieutenant Governor Davidson, Speaker T. B. Love, Senators Skinner, Veale and Faust, and Representatives Wolfe, Baskin, Holshousen, Davis of Brazos, and Robertson of Travis. When the carriage had stopped by the side of the family lot in the cemetery, Mr. Bryan walked forward with bared head, while the others grouped about him. He said:

"Truly he was a great and good man," and then calling for a box of flowers which he had left in the carriage, he walked within the enclosure and laid upon the graves of the former governor and of Mrs. Hogg gorgeous lilies and then flowers of rare beauty of other growths.

It was with reverent hand he placed his tributes upon

the grave of his friend, and those with him stood in silence as they watched the testimonial that was being paid.

"If I had been called away before him, there would not have been a more sincere mourner than he," said Mr. Bryan.

Stepping back, the great commoner's eye caught sight of a growing twig in the corner of the burial lot, and quietly asked, "Is this the pecan?" and was told that it was.

Judge Robertson, for many years the close associate and law partner of the former governor, said:

"I will say here in the presence of my friends and that Mr. Bryan may hear that when Governor Hogg was so sick in Fort Worth and I was called to his bedside—it was at the time I wrote his will—he had been sick on his back for sixteen days. He said to me: 'Robertson, I am at the forks of the road. The doctors think I am going to die, but I believe I will weather it through, and I am going to make a fight for it, but if I do die, I have so lived my life that I am prepared for the future and have no fear, and when I do pass over I will not land in a briar patch.' I asked him if he wanted to be buried in the state cemetery and he said no, that he wanted to be laid by the side of his wife, and that if he had his choice no cold marble would mark his grave, but he would have a walnut tree planted at his head and a pecan tree at his feet, and in after years, when his friends would visit the spot, they could gather the fruit and send it to their friends and be satisfied in their memory of his life."

"That reminds me of an incident in Japan," said Colonel Bryan. "It is a custom there for a devout Buddhist to place a stone lantern in the temple yard as a sign of devotion, but there was one so poor that he could not afford the stone lantern, so he brought little slips of trees and planted them on the roadside, and that road is one of the most beautiful today because of those growing trees. He could not afford the expense of the stone lantern so he went into partnership with nature."

"It is the same thought," said Judge Robertson.

"Yes, it is the same thought on the other side of the

globe," answered Colonel Bryan. "The works of men live after them and we are realizing now this great man's value."

With a reverential bow at the spot of sacred memory, Mr. Bryan turned to his carriage and, the others following, the party was driven at once to the university.

THE STEAL IN STEEL

The United States Steel (or Steal) company has issued its statement for 1906 and from this statement it appears:

First—That the gross sales were $696,756,926.01.

Second—That the company has 202,457 employes.

Third—That the employes received last year $147,765,-540.

Fourth—That the net earnings for the year amounted to $156,624,273.18.

From these figures it will be seen that the net earnings amount to about 23 per cent of the gross sales. Can the average business man do that well when he has no monopoly?

It will also be seen that the net earnings exceed the wages paid to employes. That means that each employe earns what is paid to him and in addition to that earns a profit for his employer more than equal to his wages. The company makes more than one hundred per cent profit on the wages paid; can the ordinary business man do that well when he has no monopoly?

The employes receive in wages about 21 per cent of the gross sales and yet the average tariff is about 50 per cent. What need has the steel company of the tariff which it now enjoys? And how long will the American people wait for the tariff to be reformed by its beneficiaries? Will the average business man who has no monopoly continue to vote with managers of the Steel trust?

PUBLICITY

The man who said that he would rather walk forty miles than write a letter can find interesting confirmation of his views by calling upon President Roosevelt and Mr. Harriman. Senator Depew will not thank either Mr. Harriman or President Roosevelt for drawing him into the lime light. Where oblivion is bliss, 'tis folly to be prominent. The fact that the president and Mr. Harriman slightly differ as to the exact language used at their conference does not lessen the political value of the contribution which Mr. Harriman made upon the basis of his understanding of the conversation. If the president will demand the names of the men who upon Mr. Harriman's solicitation contributed a quarter of a million to the campaign fund, the public will be in better position to judge of their disinterestedness. If Mr. Harriman's controversy with the president helps to make the latter more resolute in the advocacy of strict railroad regulation, the public will after all be the beneficiary. When republicans fall out over private conversations, the democrats get their dues.

THE SOUTHERN CANDIDATE

There is considerable talk just now of a southern candidate for the presidency, and there is no reason why a southern candidate should not be considered upon the same basis as candidates from the northern states. The time has passed when the sectional argument is effective. In the St. Louis convention of 1904 Mr. Bryan insisted that Senator Cockrell, though a confederate soldier, would poll more votes than the northern candidate whose position upon public questions was in doubt or whose position, if known, was out of harmony with the opinions of the members of his party.

By all means let the southern statesmen be considered; let them stand side by side with their northern brethren and let the choice fall upon the man who, no matter where he lives, best represents the aspirations of the

party and best reflects the desires of democratic voters. No candidate should be urged merely because he comes from the north or the south, or from the east or from the west. Local pride is a very much overestimated asset in a campaign. Comparatively few decide public questions on that basis. New York and Indiana being doubtful states, for many years claimed the candidates on the ground that local popularity would turn the elections, but it has been found that the movements which elect or defeat candidates are wider than state boundaries.

The New York Sun is the latest champion of a southern man and its desire for a southern candidate is based not upon his fitness to serve the people but upon his conservatism, and the meaning which the Sun gives to the word conservatism is well understood. It insists that the south should present a candidate who is opposed to Rooseveltism. Roosevelt having acquired popularity by the endorsement of several democratic doctrines—such as railroad regulation, trust prosecution and an income tax—the democratic party should at once repudiate these things which have given the president popularity and seek the support of the financiers whom the president has offended. This was the very argument that was made at St. Louis in 1904. We were told that the president was very unpopular with Wall street and that a safe and sane candidate who had the confidence of the business element would be able to finance his campaign in Wall street and win an easy victory. The party tried it and that bait will not serve again.

Let southern candidates be presented upon their merits. Let them be brought forward as champions of democratic ideas and they will find the north ready to listen. Papers like the Sun have overworked the conservatism of the south. Gov. Hoke Smith, of Georgia, won his campaign by attacking railroad influence in politics and by demanding regulation. Governor Cromer won his fight in Alabama along the same lines. Governor Campbell, of Texas, made speeches in favor of railroad regulation which would brand him as an anarchist according to the Sun's definition of anarchy. Here are three recent victories in three prominent southern states which

tend to show that the masses of the south are no more willing to be ridden by the corporations than are the masses of the north. There are many democrats in the south who would poll the full democratic strength of the north, but papers like the Sun do not mention them, for such papers have no more interest in a southern man who is really democratic than they have in a northern man who is democratic, because such papers are the organs of predatory wealth. Their praise damns any man upon whom they lavish it and their opposition compliments those who are honored with it.

The south furnishes most of the electoral votes of the democratic party but it does not furnish a majority of the democratic voters. In 1896 New York cast 551,000 democratic votes, more than Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana and Mississippi combined. Pennsylvania cast 433,000 democratic votes, or more than Kentucky and Virginia combined. Ohio cast 477,000 democratic votes, or more than North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee combined. Illinois cast 465,000 democratic votes—nearly 100,000 more than Texas. These figures are given to show that the selection of a democratic candidate is a matter of interest to the whole country, and in the selection it is not fair that one section should be slighted or that another section only should be considered. There are democrats in every state in the union. In many of the states they have often fought without hope, but they are none the less deserving of consideration. Democratic platforms should be made and democratic candidates should be selected with a view to strengthening the party's position all over the country, not with a view to pleasing any one section or any one element of the party.

Let us enter the next convention with an eye single to the party's good, remembering that the party can advance its interests only by advancing the interests of the country. Let us enter upon the selection of candidates, not with a view of gratifying any man's ambition or of complimenting any state or portion of the union, but with a desire to select candidates who voice the sentiments of the rank and file of the party and who, if elected, will strengthen the party's hold upon the coun-

try by proving the party deserving of public confidence. If the most available man is a southern man, let our candidate be from the south. If the most available man is a northern man, let him be from the north. If the east presents the most available man, let him be from the east. If the west can furnish the most available man, let him be from the west. The real democrat from any section will poll more votes in any other section than one whose democracy is certified to by Wall street whose iniquities have so aroused the public that even many republicans are trying to get away from their influence.

JAMES ON ASSET CURRENCY

Hon. Ollie M. James, congressman from Kentucky, made a very strong speech on the money question in the discussion of the currency bill. It was the opposition of men who like James pointed out the iniquities of the asset currency system that frightened the republican leaders into abandoning the project.

Mr. James pointed out the difference also between loaning at a fixed rate to favored banks and loaning at a competitive rate to the banks who pay the most for the money, the security being fixed. Democratic Missouri, by employing the competitive system, secures nearly three per cent a year on the money which it deposits in banks, but the federal government in the hands of republicans is so partial to the banks that it gives them the benefit of public money for nothing and thus lays the foundation for a campaign corruption fund, and the record shows that this corruption fund has been drawn upon.

A CHAMPION OF PLUTOCRACY

The Kansas City Journal seems ambitious to win distinction as the most extreme of the defenders of plutocracy. In a recent editorial entitled "The Popular Cry," it gives Harriman, Carnegie and Rockefeller a

clean bill of health and administers a caustic rebuke to those who have dared to lay anything to the doors of these benevolent "captains of industry." The following is an illustration of the whole-souledness of its defense:

"The truth about Mr. Harriman is that he has spent more money to make his railroads physically first-class than any other man in the business. His tracks and his equipment are the best that money will buy. He has spent not less than two hundred and fifty millions of dollars in the past ten years making his tracks and machinery what they should be. Kansas people have only to look at the new Union Pacific line between Kansas City and Topka for an illustration of what we mean. So far as the Alton deal is concerned, the facts are these: The Alton was once a great success. When it was practically the east end of the Santa Fe system it was a great earner, and when the Santa Fe tried to buy it the lowest price it could get was a perpetual guarantee of 8 per cent per annum on the stock at two hundred—or 16 per cent on the stock. The Santa Fe built its own line to Chicago and the Alton got so poor it could not mend its tracks or repair its engines. While it was in this fix Mr. Harriman bought it—or a control of it. He was able to give it business from the Union Pacific, Illinois Central, and Kansas City Southern, and, presto, it was valuable again. He made it as fine a piece of property physically as there is in the west and he reaped some of the benefit of bringing the property to life."

Here is a champion indeed!

"Oh! What was love made for, if 'tis not the same
Through joy and through sorrow, through glory and shame.
I know not, I ask not if guilt's in that heart,
I but know that I love thee, whatever thou art."

Some have feared that Harriman had carried his "enterprise" too far; some have intimated that he was unscrupulous, and some have even expressed the opinion that he ought to be in the penitentiary, but the Journal sees in him a public benefactor, putting his strong arms

under a weak railway system, lifting it out of the mire, and then modestly contenting himself with "some of the benefit of bringing the property to life." No one has ever drawn a more flattering pen-picture of Saint Harriman, the generous patron of the struggling road.

But the editor of the Journal is not at all partial with his favors. He is a commercial artist and his studio seems to be open to any exploiter who is willing to sit for a portrait. For instance:

"Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller began as poor boys and practiced all their lives the rules that are preached in church and Sunday school and by every careful father to his sons and daughters. Economy, thrift, industry, temperance and charity—and the greatest of these is charity. Both these men have given more money for good purposes in proportion to their means than is given by ninety-nine out of a hundred of the well-to-do people of the country—such people as are now making the noise and wearing the badges. They were lucky in getting hold of extraordinary lines of business capable of great development and destined to be greatly affected by the unforeseen events of the time. They have borne their good fortune soberly, unostentatiously, decently. They have been custodians of vast wealth, but they have not tried to eat and drink it all, they have not tried to buy office with it, they have not gambled with it, they have not corrupted politics with it. On the contrary they have given it to good purposes or kept it active in legitimate lines of business, contributing enormously to the unprecedented stretch of prosperity which has characterized the business history of the United States since they became masters in the field."

"They were lucky in getting hold of extraordinary lines of business, capable of great development and destined to be greatly affected by the unforeseen events of the time?" How lucky they were! And their luck has not deserted them, for are they not fortunate in having a biographer who can conveniently forget the evils of monopoly and the immoralities of the trust? No reference here to the criminal cases now being prosecuted against Mr. Rockefeller's company throughout the country; no reference to the extortion practiced by Mr. Carnegie's

steel trust—nothing of this kind. "They are all honorable men," or would be if the immunity bath administered by the money magnates' mouthpiece of Kansas City, could wash their guilt away. Luck seems to cover as many sins as charity, and generosity in distributing other people's money apparently atones for grand larceny in securing it. Fortunately for the country there are few editorial pages which give such unqualified endorsement to criminal business methods. The Journal boasts an odious pre-eminence in its chosen field. Paraphrasing a proverb of Solomon, it may be said: Many editors have done outrageously but the editor of the Kansas City Journal excels them all.

MONEY ABOVE DUTY

We have recently had three conspicuous instances of the fact that money offers to some of our public servants more attraction than the performance of a civic duty, Two of these instances are found in Shonts and Stevens. They were entrusted by the president with an important work. It is to be assumed that they were specially fitted for the work—the president so certified when he appointed them and they admitted their good opinion of their qualifications when they accepted. They were paid salaries which were sufficient to enable them to live in comfort and save enough in a few years to be above want the rest of their lives. While Shonts, at least, is reputed to be a millionaire it is not necessary to consider any fortune they may have acquired previously; the government was paying them enough to satisfy any reasonable ambition. But they resigned to accept larger salaries from private corporations. Why? Because they were either lacking in patriotism or made the mistake of thinking that patriotism is not involved in civil service. They revealed a low conception of duty and betrayed a sordidness that is inexcusable. If they were qualified for the work they ought not to have been allured away from it by higher salaries; if they were not qualified they ought to have resigned before.

It is going to be difficult for the government to dig the canal unless it finds engineers who put duty above money. This desertion in the hour of need is as reprehensible as the desertion of a soldier on the eve of battle. The railroads opposed the digging of the canal; its completion will mean a loss of many millions a year in transcontinental rates. The roads could afford to buy off every engineer selected, and if they are all as susceptible to a money consideration as the ones who have been employed, what will the government do? Strange that interest in this great public work and the honor of having a part in it does not outweigh money in the minds of these men.

The third illustration is to be found in the resignation of Senator Spooner. If he had given as his excuse that he was not in harmony with the republicans of his state as represented by Senator La Follette the reason would have been accepted, but he gave as his only reason for leaving public life that he could not afford to sacrifice his private interests any longer. The papers that are friendly to him mourn and the president mingles his tears with theirs—that the country is to lose the services of a great statesman. None of them suggest that he should have continued the sacrifice; they seem to assume that no one is justified in serving his country at a loss, and they do not seem to remember that official service has increased his earning power by giving him a national reputation. When a man is given a high official position his prominence can be capitalized at a large sum and many use the position as a child uses a stool in the pantry to reach the jam on the upper shelves. Paul Morton raised himself to the Equitable jam jar; Shaw stood on the treasury safe until he could reach the presidency of a trust company; Stevens raised himself on a spade until he could get hold of the traction company job, and Senator Spooner has his eye on an attorneyship which is as yet x — an unknown quantity. Why waste sympathy on the man who resigns to add to his wealth? Any prominent senator or cabinet officer could turn his position into more dollars if he would. Let us rather admire those who resist the temptation and let us hope that an increasing number will be will-

ing to serve their country in spite of inducements offered by private corporations. Instead of using these resignations to show that public salaries are too low we can better use them to show the low standard of patriotism among some of our public servants—and the argument loses none of its force even if in some cases the service has been impaired by the resignations.

STATESMAN OR FINANCIER, WHICH?

A word to the young men who are entering public life: The first and most important question for you to decide is whether you are going to be a statesman or a financier. You cannot be both and you had better understand it in the beginning than learn it by experience. The mind of the statesman is essentially different from the mind of the financier; the former looks at everything from the standpoint of the people—the latter asks whether there is any money in it.

The man who enters politics with the idea that he can make money out of his position is apt to yield to the many temptations which surround him. Most of these temptations come in disguise, especially if the public servant is an attorney. It is a very common thing for legislators and executives, if they are also lawyers, to be offered legal business by persons whose sole purpose is to influence them as legislators. One senator was offered ten thousand a year to act as associate counsel for a railroad which had business before congress, the offer being accompanied by the assurance that he need not appear in court. Congressmen are often asked to draw contracts for corporations which are seeking favors—the work to be done in private and the compensation to be liberal. Some are vain enough to think that it is their legal ability that is bargained for, but it is a very dull mind that does not understand that these lobbyists could buy all the legal ability they need at less than they offer the officials. A legislator has a right to suspect the good faith of any business offer made by a party who is seeking favors. No protestations of

friendship or disinterestedness by such can blind the eyes of the conscientious. If a lobbyist confers a favor upon a legislator he expects a return and the legislator must either subject himself to the charge of ingratitude or pay the debt at the expense of the people.

The chances are that such debts will be paid out of the pockets of the people, for the lobbyist is present to enforce his claim while the people are far away and usually unsuspicious. Unsuspicious? Yes, but their confidence when once forfeited is hard to regain. An official honor is in sacredness next to a woman's virtue and no one holding a public office can afford to allow the slightest suspicion to rest upon him. To no one more than to the statesman does the proverb apply—"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches and loving favor rather than silver and gold." If one is willing to become a grafter he can make money out of politics. Every senator can become rich if he will only sell his soul, and the opportunities of a congressman are but little less—in the end, however, it is disgrace and humiliation. In state legislation the field is more limited, but in most of the states there is a chance for the conscienceless to barter away their honor. The science of government is a noble science and office-holding is an honorable service, provided the service is performed with an eye single to the public weal.

The first lesson for the official to learn is that no man can serve two masters. This is not only Bible doctrine but it is founded on human nature. To ignore it is to disregard all experience as well as Holy Writ. One is himself deceived or is a deceiver if he attempts to serve both the public and the beneficiaries of special legislation—deceived if he thinks he can be faithful to both and a deceiver if he accepts money from both knowing that he must be false to one.

It is often said that every question has two sides but it is not true of this question. A man is lacking in either intelligence or honesty (or both) who defends the acceptance by public servants of employment from those whose interests are adverse to the interests of the public.

No legislator need be led astray. There is a test

which he can apply and by this test he can safely abide. He should not accept employment from any one unless he is willing to announce the employment and the fee immediately in the papers of his state or district.

"Our congressman, Mr. ———, finding that his special work does not occupy all his time, has accepted the offer of the Consolidated Watered-Stock Railroad to act as its Washington counsel. He is to receive ten thousand per year and his constituents will be pleased to know that he will not allow his connection with this corporation to lessen his zeal for the regulation of railroads." How would this read in a country weekly to a man who was dismissed from a jury because he was pecuniarily interested in the result of a suit?

Or suppose the notice read: "Senator ———'s friends will be pleased to know that he has secured a position as contract-drawer for the Grab-All Trust at an annual salary of twenty-five thousand. The senator is chairman of the committee which is considering several anti-trust measures, but it was his legal ability and not his official position which brought him this bit of prosperity."

What congressman or senator would like to have such a notice published? And yet why should a public servant conceal from his constituents facts which would affect their judgment of him? He is their representative and is guilty of an embezzlement of authority if he makes money by using his position against their interests. If we are to have good government we must have honest and conscientious officials, and such officials do not fear publicity—their lives are an open book. With a conscience "void of offense toward God and man" they work faithfully in the day time and sleep soundly at night. No fears haunt them and no blackmailer can levy tribute upon them. Honored while they live and mourned when they die they leave to their children an inheritance more valuable than a fortune—the good will of a community and the inspiration of an upright life.

RUSSIAN REFORM

One of the Russian reformers now visiting in this country expresses the opinion that Russia will be a republic within ten years.

He says that his country was originally a group of republics and that local self-government has always existed among the people. Education, too, is more general than is commonly supposed. Of the adult population about twenty per cent can read and write while it is estimated that some forty per cent of the younger generation can read and write. When it is remembered that these figures apply to the total population and that a still larger percentage of the males are educated it will be seen that there is an intelligent mass upon which the government can rest with security. In Japan less than ten per cent of the adult males vote and yet no one doubts that Japan has stable and progressive government, and Japan's government would be stronger if instead of being a constitutional monarchy it were a republic.

It may be a surprise to some to learn that Russia had a religious revolution before her economic or political revolution began. There are some fifteen or twenty million dissenters in that country and the dissenting ministers are more or less identified with the political uprising.

Russia has had a long, dark night but the day is breaking.

ALDRICH BILL "JOKER"

And now they say that there was "a little joker" in the Aldrich bill which recently passed congress. The language of the law providing for security to be given by banks for government deposit was as follows:

"The secretary of the treasury shall require the associations designated as depositories of public money, to give satisfactory security by the deposit of United

States bonds and otherwise for the safe keeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them."

Now it has been claimed by the banks that the words "and otherwise" authorized the treasury department to accept securities other than government bonds. At the time of the enactment of the law the people were told that government bonds alone would be accepted as security for government deposits. The language of the law above referred to was not changed by the Aldrich bill. But the "little joker" was inserted by the provision in the Aldrich bill requiring an annual report on the first day of January of each year showing the securities which had been required during that year for deposits of public money. And referring to this provision the Wall Street Journal calmly tells its readers: "By the passage of the Aldrich bill, congress has made lawful, if there was any doubt about the legality before, the acceptance by the secretary of the treasury of other bonds than those of the United States as security for United States deposits in national banks."

The Journal says that when Conrad N. Jordan was treasurer of the United States under the Cleveland administration he "required the officers of the banks in addition to depositing United States bonds, to give their personal bond for the security of the public money deposited in their institutions."

The Journal adds:

"If the law was construed in that manner at the time of its enactment there seems to be no good reason why it could not also be construed in like manner at the present time if an emergency should arise requiring larger deposits of public money in national banks at any point than could be secured by United States bonds or state, municipal and railway bonds."

Plainly this means that under the terms of the Aldrich bill when it is not convenient for the bankers to deposit United States bonds they may give state bonds, municipal bonds or railway bonds, and when it suits their purpose not to give any bonds whatever, then the personal notes of the officers of the bank will be accepted.

The Wall Street Journal printed many editorials con-

cerning the Aldrich bill while that measure was pending. Why did it not tell its readers of the "little joker?" Why did it not tell its readers that the very men who had laughed to scorn the populists' sub-treasury proposition, which, as described by one republican, meant "the loan of the public money on hay stacks, hogs and hominy," had provided for loaning the public money without interest upon the personal notes of national bankers?

A DOUBTFUL ENDORSEMENT

Mr. Carnegie gives the following endorsement to President Roosevelt: "I absolutely endorse the president's attitude toward the railroads. He is the best friend they have and they ought to realize it. The railroads had better stand with him. If they do not accept his modest measures they may be confronted by a man in the White House who will approach the question of the railroads from an entirely different standpoint. I regard the president's attitude toward the railroads as wholesome and conservative."

Now there are two sides to the railroad question—the railroad's side and the people's side. If Mr. Carnegie speaks for the railroads and is satisfied with the president's course it would look as if he feared that the next president would view the railroad from "an entirely different standpoint"—the standpoint of the people. President Roosevelt may look upon this as a doubtful endorsement.

A MODEL CONSTITUTION

The Oklahoma constitution is in print and The Commoner ventures the opinion that it is the best state constitution in the United States. It will be discussed in detail later, but this tribute is offered now. It is a people's constitution and the "cornfield lawyers" who wrote it—to use the phrase coined by the New York Tribune—have reason to be proud of their work. It ought to be

ratified by a unanimous vote and the democratic party, whose representatives framed it, deserved a splendid victory as an endorsement. It is a model constitution—the best in the nation.

WHY NOT LAFOLLETTE?

The press dispatches report that the president is quite openly supporting the candidacy of Secretary Taft, and this, too, on the theory that the secretary will carry out the president's reform ideas?

What has Secretary Taft done to indicate that he is a reformer? What assurance has the president that, as president, Secretary Taft would oppose predatory wealth? If Secretary Taft is put forward as the president's representative, who will give bond that, if elected, he will stand up bravely against the demands of Wall street? If President Roosevelt wants to leave the executive office in the hands of a republican reformer, why does he not throw his influence to Senator LaFollette? The Wisconsin senator has a record and that record ought to appeal to the president. Senator LaFollette has for years fought the same crowd that the president now finds conspiring against himself. This ought to touch the executive heart and awaken sympathy in the executive breast. Senator LaFollette is a reformer "from away back;" he is all wool and more than a yard wide, so to speak. When republican reform was, as it were, "without form and void," LaFollette appeared upon the scene and by the force of his own indomitable courage he has stayed on the scene. The national convention of 1904 which nominated the president threw him out, but like Mary's little lamb he "waited patiently about" and when election time came he was elected governor and then senator.

He has fought for reform and he has fought the republicans who opposed reform. He is in favor of railroad regulation and urges a measure empowering the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the value of the railroads. If the president will ask the railroad

exploiter and the trust magnates he will find that they know LaFollette and fear him because he says what he thinks and means what he says. If the president wants a republican who is really a reformer he will find it difficult to explain why he passes by LaFollette and selects Taft.

THAT FIVE MILLION FUND

So the president has discovered the existence of a "Five Million Dollar Fund" raised to prevent the carrying out of his ideas! Good for the president! But what ideas of his have so aroused Wall street? His ship subsidy idea? No, Wall street does not object to that. His asset currency idea? No, Wall street does not object to that. His big navy idea? No, Wall street does not object to that. His idea of enlarging the powers of the federal government at the expense of the states? No, that is just what Wall street wants.

What ideas, then, is Wall street preparing to fight? Regulation of the railroads, prosecution of trusts and the income tax. And where did the president get these ideas? From the democratic platform. Wall street also objects to the inheritance tax and this was not taken from the democratic platform although in harmony with it.

But why is the president surprised that Wall street conspires to defeat these ideas? Did not Wall street conspire to defeat these same ideas in 1896 and 1900? Did not Wall street contribute more money then to defeat these same ideas than it is preparing to contribute now? The president took part in both of those campaigns and he was on the Wall street side! Did he understand the nature of those contests and did he know that Wall street was then contributing more than five millions to defeat those same ideas? The answer must be no, for had he known then what he knows now how could he have joined in the conspiracy? Evidently, he has been studying, and now that he understands the irreconcilable contest between predatory wealth and the common people, will he forget it? Suppose Wall street

controls the republican convention and nominates a candidate satisfactory to Wall street, will his administration support the Wall street candidate? The president was very bitter in his denunciation of democrats in 1896 and 1900; will he feel more kindly toward them now that he knows against what odds they made their fight for the people? Let us hope so. And the republicans who are indignant at Wall street's opposition to the president, will they be more tolerant toward democratic reformers?

If the discovery of the "Five Million Dollar Fund" does nothing else it ought to make the president and other republican reformers sympathize with the democrats who have been fighting the corrupting influence which Wall street has exerted on American politics through its control of the republican party. Surely the stars are fighting with us when each new disclosure strengthens the democratic position, and when a republican president gives continued vindication to democratic principles.

THE "CONSERVATIVE" SOUTH

The corporation papers which are shouting that the south is the home of conservatism should publish the platform adopted by the democratic convention of Georgia on September 4 last. The attention of these papers is called especially to the following extracts:

"The great transportation companies have issued millions of dollars of stocks and bonds in excess of the money put into their properties, and they are taxing the industries of the people to pay dividends on fictitious securities."

No man can serve two masters with equal fidelity to both. Those men who elect to represent special interests and owe their first fealty to them, do not deserve, and ought not to hold, party positions of dignity, influence and power."

"The party machinery and the government, state and national, should be completely purged of such men. In our own state, by the overwhelming verdict of the peo-

ple, it has become the settled policy of the democratic party that representatives of special interests will not be permitted to hold positions of confidence and power in the counsels of the party. We earnestly commend this example to the democracy of the nation and to our democratic brethren in every state."

"We denounce in unqualified terms the use of money, liquor, free passes, telegraph, telephone and express franks and all other improper means, commonly called courtesies, by either individuals or corporations, for the purpose of influencing or buying votes, or in any way corrupting the purity of our elections."

"We demand the enactment of laws prohibiting the giving or acceptance of free passes of every character, and free service of every kind, by the transportation and public service corporations of this state, except to employes of such corporations and members of their families."

"We denounce as a crime against the public welfare, the practice of the corporations of the country in making contributions to campaign funds, and we demand the enactment of laws to prohibit and make criminal all such acts, and to provide suitable penalties for violation of the same."

"We denounce the crime of lobbying as one of the greatest offenses against the public welfare."

"We demand of the next general assembly the passage of a law clearly defining this offense, and prohibiting any employed agents or attorneys from addressing or speaking to members of the general assembly in regard to anticipated or pending legislation, except before the proper committees of said body in regular session."

"We condemn the system by which the great railroad corporations of the country have been permitted to issue fabulous amounts of fictitious or watered stocks and bonds, many times in excess of the value of the property upon which they are based. We look upon this great evil as the primary cause of excessive freight rates."

"We favor rigid government regulation of the issuance of stocks and bonds and other securities by all public service corporations, so that in future the total

amount of such securities shall bear a just relation to the money actually invested in the property of such corporations."

"The constitution of Georgia imposes upon the general assembly the duty of passing laws, from time to time, to prohibit the various railroads of Georgia charging more than just and reasonble rates for the transportation of freight and passengers."

"The method heretofore adopted for carrying out this command has been through the instrumentality of a railroad commission. This commission is charged with the duty of securing for the people of the state reasonable and just freight and passenger rates."

"It stands as the machinery provided by law to protect the public against oppression by the transportation companies. If the members of the commission do not discharge the duty imposed upon them, they fail to protect the interests of the public, and should resign or be removed. Their reasons are immaterial. Personal considerations cannot be admitted. The public welfare must not wait on formality. The people of Georgia are entitled to just rates from the carriers, and no rates can be just that are higher than the rates granted to people in surrounding states under similar conditions."

"We demand an immediate leveling of interstate rates to the basis of yielding no more than a reasonable return upon the money invested; and the abolishment of all discriminations against the people of this state, in favor of the people of other states."

"We demand that the railroad commission of Georgia shall take immediate action upon these important matters, so as to place the shippers and consumers of this state upon an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere."

"We condemn these excessive and discriminating port rates as unjust, and we demand the immediate righting of these wrongs by the railroad commission. If the commission fails to carry out our demands, we call upon the executive and legislative departments of the government to use their utmost authority to bring about a

proper reduction of rates to and from the ports to the interior, as well as rates within the state."

"We favor increasing the powers of the commission to such an etxent that it can enforce its orders by suitable, swift and certain procedure. We also favor the enactment of such laws as will make the willful refusal of railroad corporations or any of their agents to obey the orders of the commission a penal offense, to be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both."

It will be noticed that the platform says: "No man can serve two masters with equal fidelity to both. Those men who elect to represent special interests and owe their first fealty to them, do not deserve, and ought not to hold, party positions of dignity, influence and power. The party machinery and the government, state and national, should be completely purged of such men." This platform was adopted at Macon, Ga., on September 4 of last year. It was the same day, September 4, that Mr. Bryan in a speech before the Jefferson club at Chicago presented the same doctrine and pointed out that men who, like Mr. Sullivan, the democratic national committeeman from Illinois, represent corporate interests, could not faithfully represent the people also. It would seem, therefore, that Mr. Bryan was entirely in harmony with the democracy of Georgia in what he said on this subject, and if it will not offend the Wall street organs, it is here predicted that when the democrats of the nation have a chance to express themselves on this subject, they will be found to agree. It will be found that they also recognize the Bible doctrine that no man can serve two masters. The Georgia democracy is conservative in the sense that it would remedy existing abuses by the application of old time principles, but it is not conservative in the sense in which the Wall street papers use the term. The southern democrats are democratic, and any attempt to misrepresent their sincere devotion to a positive and aggressive democratic doctrine will be rebuked when they have a chance to speak through their primaries.

PRESIDENT DEFENDS SUBSIDY

President Roosevelt has written a letter addressed to Congressman Pollard of the First Nebraska district, commending him for his support of the ship subsidy bill. The president's letter to Mr. Pollard is evidently one of a number of letters sent to western members who supported the ship subsidy, and it is evident that the president in this letter intended to state for publication his reasons for favoring the ship subsidy. It is evident that he intends to bring this matter up before congress again and therefore it is worth while for the people to be considering the subject.

It is not likely that the bill can pass the house of representatives at the next session because the republican majority is only about half as large in the present congress as in the last congress. Even in the last congress forty-one republicans voted against the ship subsidy when reduced to its lowest figures, and if anything like that number of republicans oppose the subsidy in the next congress, it has no chance of passage. It must be remembered also that these forty-one republicans voted against the bill at the second session—the session held after the election when all of the jobs are pushed to the front. It might well be asked why the president did not urge this measure during the long session when there was more time for its consideration and when the people could sit in judgment upon it at the election. Instead of urging it then, the president waited until after the election and then attempted to secure the passage of the bill. If he could not succeed at a short session, he is hardly likely to succeed when the members have before them the fear of a coming election.

The president is in favor of closer communication between North and South America. Very good. So are all the people regardless of party, but how can we cultivate more intimate relations with South America? Can we do it by subsidizing ships to bring South American products to our port and then shut out those products by a high tariff wall? There is something absurd in all this talk of encouraging foreign commerce when

we deliberately exclude so many articles of commerce from our markets by prohibitive tariffs.

It is also absurd to protect a few shipbuilders by laws which prohibit the purchase of foreign ships and then tax the whole public to compensate the shipowners for the burdens placed upon them in the interest of the shipbuilders.

There are three objections to a ship subsidy, first—that it is unfair to the mass of the people to single out a few steamship lines for favoritism and to tax the rest of the people for the benefit of these few; second—because a subsidy once granted, could not be withdrawn. If our experience in this matter was similar to our experience in tariff matters, we would find it necessary to increase the subsidy from time to time. It requires a higher tariff now to protect adult industries which export in competition with the world than we asked for the encouragement of these industries when infants; third—the ship subsidy plan is not the best plan of establishing more intimate commercial relations with South America. The Commoner suggested several years ago that some of the money now being put into warships ought to be put into transports and these transports used in time of peace for the establishment of desirable lines of traffic. If the American people can afford to pay a subsidy to shipowners in order to establish lines of communication between our coast and South America, they can afford to establish these lines themselves and use their own ships. They could either operate these vessels themselves and use them for the training of seamen as well as for the promotion of commerce, or they could lease the vessels to ship companies on conditions that would establish the lines where lines are wanted and limit the profits of the company to a certain percentage. If the government establishes its own lines, the people get what they pay for and the lines can be suspended whenever they are found unprofitable. If lines are subsidized the expense is likely to be far in excess of the advantage, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to withdraw the support.

The president has gained popularity by advocating certain democratic doctrines, but he has gained no popu-

larity by his advocacy of a ship subsidy, which is not only not democratic but is opposed by a very large and respected element of the republican party. If the republican congressmen who voted against the ship subsidy represent their constituents, it is apparent that less than half of the members of the republican party favor the ship subsidy.

The president's position on the ship subsidy is inconsistent with his position on the railroad question, on the trust question, and on the income tax, and he will find that he only weakens his power to do good by his attempt to help a few shipowners to reach their hands into the public treasury.

ANDREW CARNEGIE'S MAGIC LAMP

At the dedication of the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburg recently—an institute made possible by Mr. Carnegie's "generosity"—Mr. Carnegie made a speech in which he said: "I have tried to make myself realize that I have anything to do with it, and have failed. * * * It is true that I gave some pieces of paper, but they do not represent anything in my mind, because I did not part with anything that I can understand. * * * I said to Mrs. Carnegie last night: 'It is like the palace raised in the night by the genii who obeyed Aladdin.' She replied: 'Yes, and you did not even have to rub the lamp.'"

No, Mr. Carnegie did not even have to rub the lamp. The American people not only provided the lamp, but they rubbed it and summoned the genii which worked industriously night and day to take from the providers and rubbers of the lamp their hard earned money, and after taking this money from them turned it over to Mr. Carnegie. The name of this lamp is "protective tariff." But what name shall be given to the people who provided this magic lamp and then rubbed it for Mr. Carnegie's benefit?

There is a series of "comic" pictures running in a number of daily papers that illustrate the trials of a

gentleman who is always being buncoed by artful strangers. He is named "Mr. E. Z. Mark." Would that not be a good name to give to the voters of America who have sweat and toiled to provide Mr. Carnegie with a "magic lamp," and after having provided it work overtime to rub it and pour treasure into the pockets of the gentleman who admits that he "doesn't even have to rub the lamp?"

Some of these days the voters of America will destroy Mr. Carnegie's "magic lamp" and proceed to make one that will, when rubbed, pour treasure into the pockets of the maker and rubbers.

"HUMILIATED"

The Chicago Chronicle declares that President Roosevelt has been "greatly humiliated" by the compliments paid him by certain democrats, notably John Temple Graves and Mr. Bryan. The Chronicle says: "President Roosevelt has not deserved the humiliation."

It must hurt the president terribly to hear a democrat speak a good word for him occasionally. Perhaps he would prefer to have his compliments come exclusively from men who, like John R. Walsh, proprietor of the Chicago Chronicle, have been indicted one hundred and odd times for fraudulent transactions.

If Mr. Roosevelt can prosper with an everyday enthusiastic endorsement by Walsh, he ought to be able to survive an occasional kind word by humble democrats.

MR. BRYAN TO "THE WALL STREET JOURNAL"

The following in reply to a letter addressed to Mr. Bryan appeared in a recent number of the Wall Street Journal:

To the Editor of the Wall Street Journal: I find your favor upon my return to the city and take pleasure

in answering your questions, and you are at liberty to publish the letter if you so desire.

If you will carefully read my Madison Square Garden speech, you will find that I did not discuss government ownership as an immediate issue, but as an ultimate solution of the controversy.

I prefaced my remarks by saying that I did not know whether the country was ready to consider the question or whether a majority of the members of my own party agreed with me.

For some fourteen years after my entrance into national politics I hoped for effective railroad legislation and was brought reluctantly to the belief that government ownership furnished the only satisfactory remedy for the discrimination, rebates and extortions practiced by the railroads and for the corruption which they have brought into politics.

My first public expression on this subject was after the national convention of 1904. Two reasons led me to discuss the subject at that time. First, the triumph of the reactionary element at St. Louis discouraged the more radical members of our party. Feeling sure, from contact with the rank and file of our organization, that the ascendancy of the so-called conservative leaders would be temporary, I appealed to the radical democrats to remain with the party, secure control of the organization and make the party an effective instrument in securing needed reforms.

To encourage these progressive democrats to remain with the party, I announced the conclusion which I had reached in regard to the final necessity for government ownership.

My second reason for bringing the subject forward then was that federal ownership of all the railroads was the only plan discussed by the advocates of government ownership and I thought it worth while to present the dual plan which would, in my judgment, give the country the benefit of government ownership without the centralization involved in the plan which puts the federal authorities in control of the railroad systems of the country.

The dangers of centralization are real dangers, however difficult it may be to get the people as a whole to consider theories in advance of their application.

AT THE BEGINNING OF RAILROAD DEVELOPMENT

We are not at the end of railroad development but rather at its beginning, and I feel, as I have always felt, that the ownership and operation by the federal government of all the railroads, now constructed and to be constructed, would go far toward the obliteration of state lines and I regard the preservation of our dual form of government as necessary to the perpetuity of the republic.

The plan according to which the federal government is to own only the necessary trunk lines and the several states the remainder of the roads is consistent with our form of government and instead of leading to centralization promises to build up the states and thus offer a sure bulwark against centralization. I have been surprised that this plan should be opposed on the ground that it would lead to centralization when it was the fear of this that led me to present the plan.

While the plan was proposed before I knew of its having been tried in other countries, I have since learned that it has been successfully employed in other countries, notably in Germany, where nearly all the railroads are owned by the several states.

When in Germany last summer, I was told by a member of the reichstag that as a result of this system the credit and influence of the several states had been greatly strengthened.

That the dual plan is practicable must be evident to any one who has seen the manner in which the small states of Europe handle their international traffic.

SYSTEM SHOULD BE INAUGURATED GRADUALLY

Having set forth the plan and my reasons for setting it forth at the time I did, I will now answer your questions.

It is not necessary that there should be many trunk

lines. Some have assumed that every line which runs through two or more states is a trunk line, but this does not necessarily follow. Only enough trunk lines are necessary to give each state an outlet for the merchandise shipped over the state lines. While it is not likely that adjoining states would have any difficulty in making joint traffic arrangements still the operation of a few federal trunk lines would give to each state an independent position.

As to the acquiring of lines, I suppose that all would agree that the system should be inaugurated gradually, so that the government could profit by experience. It is probable that a commencement would be made with one trans-continental line, with a possible cross line. A line from the Atlantic to the Pacific crossed by a line from the Lakes to the Gulf would do more to demonstrate the wisdom or the folly of government ownership than all the arguments that could be made for or against the system. If the government is incompetent to attend to such matters and too extravagant in public work, the private roads need not be afraid of competition. In fact, they ought to welcome the experiment. If, on the other hand, the government shows that it can reduce rates, improve the service, accord better treatment to employes and still earn a fair profit on the investment, who can justly complain if the government road squeezes water out of stocks, reduces private management to an honest basis and compels the roads to give better rates to patrons and better terms to employes?

GOVERNMENT CAN BUY OR BUILD

These experimental lines can be bought or built, whichever the government officials think best. I have not entered upon the details of the plan or attempted to decide upon what basis the government should buy. If it announced its purpose to buy a line there would probably be a number offered and it could have its choice. The government might buy a controlling interest in a line—that is the way the railroad magnates do. If it built a new line, the success of the new line would largely determine the value of other lines offered for sale to

the nation or to the various states. Our commerce is increasing so rapidly that a new line would not materially lessen the business of the old lines; there is even now need for more transcontinental lines and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul is building through to the coast to meet this demand. The transcontinental roads have not been able to carry the freight offered to them and the Union Pacific is earning an income on considerably more than the value of the road.

If it was thought best the government could do as France did: authorize lines, guaranteeing fair dividends and contributions to a sinking fund which at the end of a term of years would give the government the title to the roads.

If any one doubts the financial success of a government trunk line, he must overlook the fact that the mails at the present rates would at once furnish quite an item of business.

It is not fair to compare government roads in other countries with private roads in this country. The public roads of Europe are equal to the private roads of Europe—that is the only fair comparison. Our municipal plants in this country are as good as the private plants and furnish service at a lower rate, which is evidence that the public ownership of roads is feasible.

WHAT THE STATES COULD DO

Being assured of an outlet for the traffic of their roads, the states could proceed to acquire local roads slowly or rapidly as they wished. If the people of any state preferred to leave the local lines in private hands they could do so; if they desired to build new roads, they could build them; if they desired to buy existing roads upon such terms as seemed best, they could do that.

The dual plan suits itself to the views of the people in each state and to conditions to be met in the several localities. If trunk lines were so operated as to permit private roads to use them upon equitable terms, it would be of still greater advantage. At present the small lines are forced into consolidation in order to secure an out-

let for their traffic; as soon as these private lines tapped a government line they would be independent.

Objection has been made to government ownership on the ground that it would prevent the states from exercising police power over the operation of the roads. This objection might be made against the federal ownership of all the roads but it does not lie against the dual plan. For, first, if the states did not choose to own the local lines, they could exercise the same control over them that they do today. Second, if they desired to own the local lines, their control would be even more complete than it is today. Third, an act of congress could provide for the operation of trunk lines in harmony with the police laws of the various states, and fourth, the states could be permitted to run local trains over the trunk lines.

NO SUDDEN CHANGE CONTEMPLATED

You will see from the above that no sudden change is contemplated. On the contrary, the change, if adopted, must necessarily be slow. It ought not to be treason in a country like ours to suggest that the people themselves are the ones to determine what should be done, and the plan which I have proposed provides for the inauguration of the change with the least possible disturbance.

It is needless to say that no confiscation is proposed. There is no disposition under either strict regulation or government ownership to do injustice to investors in railroad securities, and the courts would prevent injustice even if it were attempted. As a matter of fact, the people have been more ready to do justice to the railroads than the railroad managers have been to do justice to the people.

If the railroad managers had respected the rights of the public, there would have been no talk of government ownership, but instead of that they have used the power given them through their ownership of lines to juggle the price of stock, to discriminate against shippers and cities and to collect from the helpless public

all that the traffic would bear. They have combined to destroy competition and then divided the spoils.

When regulation has been attempted they have terrorized congress and state legislatures and have corrupted officials. If the sentiment has turned against private ownership, the railroad managers have only themselves to blame.

POPULAR FAITH IN REGULATION

At this time a majority of the people still seem to have faith in regulation, and the first thing necessary is to ascertain the present value of the railroads and then prevent any more watering of stock. I shall assist as far as I am able to test regulation under as favorable conditions as can be created, but having reached the conclusion that, in the end, regulation will be found ineffective, I have stated the conclusion.

As I was slow in reaching this conclusion myself, I can be patient with those who honestly fear government ownership. In the meantime, I am anxious that those who become convinced of the necessity of government ownership shall consider the plan which reduces centralization to a minimum and adds to the influence and vigor of the state. Very truly yours,

Lincoln, Neb., April 6. W. J. BRYAN.

CLEVELAND ON INSURANCE

Former President Cleveland is just now engaged in a work which is not likely to add to either his laurels or his reputation. As counsel for the Life Insurance presidents he has submitted a brief in relation to the power of states to take salaries paid to Life Insurance officials into consideration in laws regulating insurance. As this brief is intended for use in opposing state legis-

lation it puts the ex-president in a class with the lobbyists—a rather undignified position for one of his standing. But as he is the custodian of his own reputation less exception can be taken to his employment than to the legal opinion which he has given. He denies the right of the state to put a limit on salaries paid to officials by companies doing business within its borders. The objection which he raises goes to the very root of the question of control. If the states are powerless to protect policyholders from losses sustained through extravagant salaries, of what value is state authority. The ex-president bases his opinion on the theory that no line can be drawn between the natural person and the corporation. While it is true that some of the courts have confused this line it is, nevertheless, a very clear and distinct line. The natural person has natural and inalienable rights while the corporation has only those rights which are conferred upon it by law. Man was created to carry out a Divine decree, the corporation was created as a money-making institution. It is only fair that the natural persons in one state shall stand upon an equal footing with the natural persons of another state, but there is neither reason nor logic in the position that a state can create corporate giants and then without properly controlling them demand that they be given all the rights and immunities of natural persons IN ADDITION TO THE SPECIAL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES CONFERRED BY LAW.

The whole object of an incorporation law is to grant to the corporation certain rights and privileges which the individual does not enjoy; if the corporation is to have these and then have all the rights and immunities of the natural person, the man-made corporation will be placed on a higher plane than the God-made man. If the insurance companies begin a systematic crusade against state control they will develop a sentiment in favor of state insurance just as the railroad managers, by resisting state regulation, create a sentiment in favor of government ownership. Mr. Cleveland's position is both undignified and undemocratic.

CLEAR ON ONE POINT, ANYWAY

The New York Times devotes considerable space to an editorial entitled, "The Delusions of Mr. Bryan," in which editorial it consigns to the tomb Mr. Bryan and the political principles for which he stands.

Well Mr. Bryan may have some delusions, but he is not so deluded as to imagine that in any advice the New York Times may give to the democratic party or to the American people, that great newspaper is actuated by any desire to interfere with special interests or to make material contribution to popular government.

MISSED LA FOLLETTE

The Wall Street Journal says: "President Roosevelt makes no secret of his desire, which is a natural one, for the election of a successor, who would carry out the policy with which his administration is identified." How, then, did Mr. Roosevelt happen to overlook the high claims of Senator LaFollette in the search for a successor?

MR. HEARST'S NEW PARTY

Attention has already been called to Mr. Hearst's New York speech on the evening of April 13, in which he expressed his dissatisfaction with existing parties and his determination to organize a new party through the instrumentality of the Independence League. That Mr. Hearst means well will be admitted, but there will be a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of his action. In joining a party a man naturally asks two questions: First, what does the party stand for? And second, what chance has the party of accomplishing its purpose? The second question is scarcely less important than the first for unless a party has a prospect of putting its principles into law it strives in vain, and because it strives in vain it does not appeal to the people.

Of course a party may do educational work without dominating the government and all parties, however small, do educational work, but the great majority of the voters prefer to see results rather than to do pioneer work. Mr. Hearst complains that the democratic party is not harmonious—that is true. But unfortunately there is no chance of securing absolute harmony in any party of any size. If a party has as many as two members the conservative and radical elements will appear. Even where all agree in principles there will be differences of opinion as to methods and such differences cause almost as much trouble as differences in principle. The republican party seemed to be a united party when it came into power in 1861 and yet before Lincoln had been in office three years the radical element of the party thought him too conservative; and before eight years elapsed a republican congress tried to impeach a republican president.

The Independence League must grow in order to exert a great influence and it cannot draw to itself any considerable number of thinking men without becoming a debating society.

Whether the new party is really needed is a matter which time alone can decide. Mr. Hearst has a large personal following and his papers exert a marked influence. He has left the democratic party because he has lost faith in its power to secure reforms and the Independence League will offer a political home to those who despair of relief through either the democratic or republican parties, but it cannot hope to attract those democrats who still believe that the democratic party can be made an effective instrument in the hands of the people for the securing of remedial legislation; neither can it expect to attract reform republicans unless those republicans believe that the Independence League can bring reform sooner than the democrats can.

The Commoner has faith in the democratic party—not in its infallibility or in its freedom from mistakes, but in the patriotic purpose of the rank and file of the party and in the prospect of an early victory for that party. The democratic party has made mistakes—what party has not?—but today it stands for positive and

progressive democracy and in 1908 its platform, its candidates and its organization will be such as to appeal to the conscience and judgment of the reform element of the country. If the democratic party ignores its greatest opportunity and disappoints loyal democrats the Independence League will grow rapidly, but if the democracy does what it ought to do—and The Commoner believes that it will—the members of the Independence League are likely to be found supporting the democratic ticket just as the members of the populist party supported the democratic ticket in 1896 and 1900.

In the meantime democratic papers should treat Mr. Hearst and the new party as an ally rather than as an enemy. We are going in the same direction even though we march under different banners, and there ought to be no quarrel so long as we are trying to "cast out devils," although we invoke the name of democracy while Mr. Hearst and his associates invoke the name of the Independence League.

THE CONSTITUTION SUPREME

Secretary Root and Senator Beveridge seem to agree with the president that the constitution of the United States is rather an insignificant thing when it runs up against a treaty. They argue that a treaty is superior to the laws and constitutions of the several states, but they overlook the fact that a treaty is unconstitutional if it violates the constitution of the United States and an unconstitutional treaty is not binding. The president and the senators are sworn to support the constitution of the United States and if they ignore the provisions of that constitution so much the worse for them. Suppose the president and senate should join in a treaty providing that no American could avail himself of the writ of habeas corpus if arrested on complaint of a foreigner residing in this country, would such a provision be upheld by the courts? Suppose, then, that the president and senate agree to nullify the constitutional

amendment giving the state control of their local affairs, would that be upheld by the courts?

If our federal constitution can only be amended by the concurrence of two-thirds of both houses of congress and three-fourths of the states, or by the concurrence of three-fourths of the states in an amendment submitted by a constitutional convention can that constitution be overridden by the president and senate without the approval of the popular branch of congress and without consulting the several states? If the courts hold that the constitution is not binding on the treaty making power it will be time for a constitutional amendment giving some constitutional strength to our constitution.

WHERE DOES MR. TAFT STAND?

Congressman Longworth of Ohio says that Secretary Taft is the proper man to "carry to completion" the reform work undertaken by President Roosevelt, and it has been announced semi-officially that the president, himself, desires the secretary's nomination. The question that naturally arises is: For what reforms does Secretary Taft stand?

How far does he go on the subject of railroad regulation? Is he satisfied with the present law which the railroad republicans of the senate forced the president to accept? (The president could have secured a better law by accepting democratic aid, but he compromised in order to make it seem a republican measure.) Is Secretary Taft in favor of the LaFollette amendment (which the republicans of the senate voted down) authorizing the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the value of the railroads? Is he in favor of legislation which will prevent the watering of stock and the issue of fictitious capitalization? Will he speak out on these questions and define his position, or will he have his conservative supporters reassure the railroads while the president rounds up the radical republicans for him? If he becomes president he will have the appointment of

interstate commerce commissioners; will he appoint men who sympathize with the patrons of the roads?

Where does he stand on the trust question? Is he against the principle of private monopoly or does he believe merely in trying to regulate monopolies? Does he believe in enforcing the criminal law against trust magnates? And is he satisfied with the enforcement of the law against just a few of the trusts?

How about the income tax? Does he endorse the president's position on that question? And does he regard swollen fortunes as a menace? Is he for arbitration of labor difficulties? What does he think now of government by injunction? Is he still an imperialist, or does he accept the American theory that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Is he willing to take the people into his confidence or does he expect to secure the nomination without disclosing his position, and then run on an ambiguous platform? Has he faith enough in his own principles and in the people to make an open, honest fight for definite reforms?

Where does Secretary Taft stand? What does he stand for in the way of reforms? President Roosevelt's platform said nothing about reforms in 1904 and the president himself gave no intimation of reform tendencies until after the election. Will Secretary Taft follow the president's example and fool the big corporations or will he follow the example of several other presidents and fool the people?

He should speak now or forever after hold his peace.

"LIFE TERM"

C. W. Post of Battle Creek, Mich., in an article printed in the Chicago Record-Herald, concerning a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, says: "I am a strong advocate of continuing a capable executive in the presidential office as long as he may live or can be induced to serve. In a successful commercial corporation we do not shelve first-class executives because we think it would be pleasant for the friend of some of our friends to see how it

would feel to occupy that chair and attempt to control affairs for a term. It will be better for this country when the people decide to conduct its affairs in line with well-accepted commercial practice rather than in the manner it is now conducted."

This advocacy of a "life term" is probably a little too bold to please the third term boomers.

CENTRALIZATION

President Stickney of the Chicago Great Western Railroad company recently visited the White House and discussed with both the president and the interstate commerce commission the railroad situation. Mr. Stickney claims that as a matter of law the federal courts must hold that the states cannot interfere with or attempt to regulate railroad traffic, even when it is wholly within a state, because to do so would be to interfere also with interstate traffic, which is specifically under the exclusive jurisdiction of congress. He claims, in short, that the power over interstate commerce necessarily includes sole power over state commerce.

The Washington correspondent for the Omaha World-Herald says:

"Mr. Stickney declared that both the president and the commissioners believe that as a matter of good sense and business his proposition ought to be sustained. They are satisfied that conflicting jurisdiction will ultimately greatly impede efforts to control carriers. Mr. Stickney presented to the president many illustrations of these conflicts, and he arranged with the secretary of the commission that the latter shall provide him with as many illustrations as possible of these conflicts which have fallen under the observation of the commission. Mr. Mosely said today that the number of these is very great. Mr. Stickney will prepare a brief of this matter for the use of his lawyers in the course of the next few months, when they come to the supreme court with the case, appealed from Minnesota, in which the Great Western has raised the novel contention of President Stickney. The

latter declares he is confident his claim will be sustained if in the meanwhile he can do some effective educational work."

The Stickney view carried to its logical conclusion would take from the state all its power. In that view the state could not legislate with respect to loan and trust companies, or insurance companies while every merchant from the dealer in silks and calicoes, to the dealer in liquors would look to the federal government for his rules.

It is an absurd proposition and the people will not overlook the fact that only a few months ago when the railroad magnates were being "annoyed" by the proceedings on the part of the federal authorities they and their spokesmen insisted that states rights should be preserved and that the federal power must not encroach upon the authority of the state. But recently the state power has been exercised and in a very effective way. Where the action of the federal authorities merely "annoyed" the railroad magnates, legislation by the states brought them to their knees. It is plain now that in their desperation the speculators who are in charge of our railroads have adopted the centralized government plan; that they intend to move for a destruction of the state's power over the railroads and the deposit of that power exclusively in the federal government; and that they intend, also, to make desperate effort to see that the federal government is placed in the hands of men who will not seriously interfere with the "business enterprise" of the Harrimans.

IN A BAD WAY

The republican party is now in such straits that it has just one man whom it regards as popular enough to be a candidate for president. Is there any parallel in history to a situation in which a party hinges its success on one man, and when that man is one who has had the courage to drop his own platform and adopt that of the opposition party?

The republican party has claimed a monopoly of intelligence, while it has fostered a monopoly of everything else. Isn't it strange that with all the brains it claims to have, it has no other popular man in the party?

THINK OF THIS!

It is worth while to note that the main effect of the new interstate commerce law, so far, has been to enable the railroads to keep the rebates that they used to pay to favored shippers. This puts all the shippers on the same footing, but what benefit has it brought to the public which pays the rates? The states, however, have been reducing passenger rates from 3 cents to 2 cents, a reduction of 33 1-3 per cent, and the public gets the benefit. No wonder the railroads prefer federal to state control.

FRIGHTENED AGAIN

The New York papers are frightened again. They have discovered a new issue—they caught it red-handed just as it was making its exit from the Brooklyn banquet after a savage attack on the life of the democratic party. It is a double-headed monster which the scientists have classified as the "initiative and referendum." Its purpose is to put out of business the boss, the lobbyist and the trafficker in public trust. Of course it is obnoxious to subsidized papers and to the exploiters of the public who find fortunes in the grabbing of franchises and in the watering of stock.

After these papers have recovered from the frenzy into which they were thrown by Mr. Bryan's remarks about the initiative and referendum some friend should call the attention of their editors to the fact that the doctrine which so alarmed them is not new at all. It is already in practical use, to a greater or less extent, in nearly every state and its application is being constantly broadened. The referendum is employed in the adop-

tion of constitutions and it is being used with increasing frequency in the issue of municipal bonds and in the granting of franchises.

Several states have so extended the use of the initiative and referendum as to secure to the people the right to sit in judgment on legislative measures and to compel the submission of any question upon which they desire to act. Maine will at her next election vote upon the adoption of the plan for "direct legislation," as this plan is called, and the New Jersey house of representatives turned it down by a small majority. Neither is it a new subject with Mr. Bryan. He has discussed it in all parts of the country, beginning more than ten years ago. It was in the Nebraska platform in 1896:

"We favor the initiative and referendum system as an aid to securing a government of the people, for the people and by the people."

It was in the democratic national platform of 1900:

"We favor an amendment to the federal constitution providing for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, and we favor direct legislation wherever practicable."

Is this news to the newspapers of New York? We are gradually applying the fundamental principles of our government to new conditions and that application will continue.

For one hundred years after the adoption of the federal constitution the people endured the election of United States senators by legislatures; in 1892 the national house of representatives passed for the first time a resolution proposing the amendment necessary to secure the direct election of senators. Since then the house has four times more passed the same resolution and something like two-thirds of the states have endorsed the reform. It will come. And so will the initiative and referendum come in time, for both the initiative and referendum are in harmony with the theory that this is "a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

THE DEMOCRATIC POSITION

A Kansas democratic club asks The Commoner to set forth briefly some of the reasons which can be given by democrats for the support of their party's position, and the request is cheerfully complied with.

First—The democratic party believes in the theory of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence, namely, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The party was formed by Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and has ever borne the impress of his personality.

While all parties have until recent years to a greater or less extent given adherence to the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the democratic party has differed from the parties which have opposed it in that it has emphasized the fact that the representative is the servant of his constituents, while the parties that take their inspiration from Alexander Hamilton regard the representative as more or less independent of his constituents. It makes a great deal of difference whether the public official recognizes it as his duty to give expression to the wishes of those who elected him or considers himself a sort of superior being elected to act for the people but not to be controlled by them. The official who assumes the right to disregard the wishes of those who elect him strikes at the very foundation of popular government.

Second—The democratic party believes in the inalienable rights of the individual and zealously guards those rights from infringement. There are individual rights sacred from the touch even of the majority, as for instance, the right to life, to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness, and the amendments to the constitution have named freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of the conscience as necessary to the preservation of the inalienable rights of man.

Third—The democratic party is the champion of local self-government, believing that that government is best

which is nearest to the people and that the people can act most intelligently upon the subjects with which they are most familiar.

Fourth—The democratic party, believing in the inalienable rights of the individual and in the wisdom of local self-government, insists upon respect being shown to the constitutional provision which reserves to the states and to the people respectively the powers not expressly delegated to the federal government or denied to the states. This balance of power between the state and federal governments is essential to the life of the republic.

Fifth—The democratic party believes in the exercise by the federal government of its delegated powers in such a way as to protect the interests of all the people without giving favoritism to any part of the country—equal rights to all and special privileges to none being its motto.

Sixth—The democratic party, believing that governments rest upon the consent of the governed, is in favor of such improvements in the methods of government as will make the government more directly responsible to the people and more responsive to the will of the people. It naturally favors the election of senators by direct vote of the people, the direct primary, and the initiative and referendum.

Seventh—In taxation the democratic party believes that the burdens of government should be collected in such a way that each citizen will contribute in proportion to the benefits received under the protection of the government. Carrying out this theory of taxation, it has opposed a tariff levied purely for the purpose of protection and has urged the income tax as a means of equalizing taxation.

Eighth—The democratic party believes in economy in public expenditures. Taxation being not a blessing but a necessary evil, should be limited to the needs of the government economically administered.

Ninth—The democratic party being the foe of special privilege, is the natural enemy of the private monopoly.

It has presented the only sound and consistent anti-trust platform in declaring that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

Tenth—The democratic party believes that the corporation created by law should ever be subservient to the law. It would insert in each corporate charter "Remember thou thy creator" not only in youth but throughout its existence.

Eleventh—The democratic party in its efforts to secure the equal treatment of all the people according to their merits, naturally takes the part of the laboring man in his opposition to government by injunction and in his demands for arbitration and an eight hour day.

Twelfth—The democratic party is opposed to imperialism at home and abroad, and denies that a republic can consistently hold colonies and administer governments outside of and in conflict with the principles of the constitution of the United States.

Thirteenth—As might be inferred from the foregoing, the democratic party is opposed to swollen fortunes, and it would relieve the country of the menace of such fortunes by withdrawing the special privileges which have enabled these fabulous fortunes to be accumulated in so short a time. It would restore in society God's law of rewards so far as government is able to do so. God's law, as shown in nature, suits the reward to the contribution one makes in energy, industry and intelligence. If the government would cease to permit a few to monopolize that which belongs to all, there would be no fortunes so swollen as to vex the country.

The club also asks what issue will be paramount. No one can speak with accuracy so far ahead, but it seems evident that the trust question will occupy a prominent place, and as it is more intimately connected with the tariff question and the railroad question, it can hardly fail to attract a large share of public attention next year. The contest between predatory wealth on the one side and the unorganized masses on the other cannot be put off, although it is impossible to say in just what form the issue will present itself.

The young man who is seeking to use his influence for

the promotion of the welfare of the common people will find the democratic party the best organization through which to act. It is not perfect in its personnel, but perfection is not to be expected among men. It may not go as far as all reformers wish, but it is going in the right direction. It may be more radical than some conservatives would like to have it, but a reasonable radicalism is necessary if a more extreme radicalism is to be avoided. The indications are that in 1908 the party will be able to add to those who have supported it a large number who recognize the necessity of remedial legislation fashioned according to democratic principles. It is not the party of any class or section of the country. It appeals to rich and poor alike and promises to secure as far as it can justice to all.

GOVERNOR WOODRUFF

Governor Woodruff of Connecticut, addressed a meeting of the economic league at New Haven recently and made what the Hartford Courant calls "a sensational speech in denunciation of the lobby-ridden general assembly." The governor frankly confessed that he had been "turned down" by the legislature and bluntly admitted that if he could get that legislature to pass one bill drawn in the public interest, he would be performing "a miracle." The governor said: "I look upon government as a plain business proposition, in which the state puts men into office to attend to the people's affairs. The governor and the general assembly are servants of the commonwealth, acting under its constitution and they are responsible directly to the people for the way they carry on the state's business. Would you keep men in your employ who were working against your interests? I guess not. Would you engage men to manage your business who were under the influence of other men and other interests directly opposed to your concern? I guess not. This is very plain talk—easily understood. It does not contain any charge against any man in the general assembly who is doing his duty as

a representative of the people; but it does charge every man in the assembly who is controlled or coerced by the secret power of corrupt influence with being a traitor to his trust, an enemy of the state, unfit to hold office in the general assembly. The time of the general assembly is wasted in juggling with legislation. What a deplorable spectacle is presented to our view of the law-making power of this commonwealth paralyzed by the grip of lobbyists! How long will Connecticut stand for this?"

This republican governor deserves the cordial support of all good citizens in Connecticut and the hearty commendation of men everywhere. Corporation lobbies cannot last long in a state where the governor is watchful and brave enough to speak out in the public interest.

More power to Governor Woodruff's elbow.

A DIAGRAM

A Commoner reader asks for the publication of this diagram:

Query, Commoner, March 22: "Will the present secretary of the treasury now hasten to reimburse Mr. Perkins? It was the present secretary of the treasury who handled the money in bulk last."

Answer, New York World, March 27: "Secretary Cortelyou today gave substantial relief to the financial situation in Wall street by directing that the customs receipts at New York he placed in the national depositories in the city and by anticipating the interest payment on the two per cent consols of 1930, due April 1. The comptroller of the currency went to the aid of the street by calling for a report of the condition of national banks at the close of business March 22. This will result in the banks depleting their reserves and releasing a large amount of money now held in the vaults."

The National Bank of Commerce, J. P. Morgan's bank, is one of them. Perkins is Mr. Morgan's partner.

"UNDERSIRABLE CITIZENS"

The news columns of The Commoner have already contained references to the president's letters in which he classes Harriman and Moyer with the undesirable citizens. The first letter was given to the public in reply to a letter written by Mr. Harriman, and in making this letter public the president may not have intended to influence the Moyer trial, which was soon to take place. His object was to strike back at Harriman and he may not have thought of the effect of his language on the trial court and jury. In his second letter, however, he discussed this very subject and accused the friends of Moyer and Haywood of trying to influence the action of the court. It is strange that it did not occur to him that his caustic criticism of the accused would have far more influence on the court and jury than any eulogies pronounced by the friends of the accused. In a criminal case the accused is not only entitled to a fair trial but he is entitled to any presumption of innocence which may be raised by previous good character as shown at the trial. It is not fair therefore for the president to take the stand and testify against the character of the men on trial where conviction involves the death penalty. He does not confront the accused in court and is not subject to cross-examination and his letter is likely to have more weight with any Roosevelt republicans who may be accepted on the jury than all the testimony which the defendants can introduce to show a good reputation. No one should try to excuse the accused if the evidence shows that they committed murder, and no one should want to convict them unless the evidence does establish their guilt. Until the evidence is in the public generally will withhold judgment. If the friends of Moyer and Haywood demand their acquittal regardless of the evidence they deserve criticism; if they attempt to influence the court and jury they should be censured, but being private citizens their offense is not so grave as that of the president, whose position as well as his great influence should restrain him from using language, whether intentionally or through indiscretion, calculated to prevent a fair trial.

MR. BRYAN IN NEW ENGLAND

The distinguished visitor within Hartford's gates today did not bring his welcome along, and he did not have to; it was here all the while—ready and hearty—waiting for him. If he enjoys being here half as well as Hartford enjoys seeing him here, he'll have a happy day. That's what we all want him to have.

When he was here eleven years ago, it was a political visit; and he called Hartford a stronghold, or citadel, or something like that, of money; and perhaps we Hartforders were pleased rather than otherwise. Certainly nobody was offended. There's a lot more money in Hartford now than there was in 1896; there is also a much juster appreciation of William Jennings Bryan. He did not convert us to his economic beliefs then, and he isn't going to try to now. But we have all come to a recognition of the fine traits of his character, the amiability of his manners and the singular charm of his eloquence.

Come right in, Mr. Bryan, and make yourself at home. This is your city today, sir—Hartford Daily Courant.

IN 1896 AND TODAY

When William J. Bryan came to New Haven in 1896 and tried to speak on the green he was hissed by hundreds and the Yale boys made it impossible for him to finish his speech.

If any republican had then suggested that Mr. Bryan would be welcomed by a republican governor and formally invited to address a republican legislature in "general assembly convened," that republican might have escaped a tailor-made coat of tar and feathers, but he wouldn't have any longer been known as a republican.

But 1896 was eleven years ago.

Bryan was called a "radical" then and men "viewed" him with curiosity, locking their strong boxes first and hanging onto their pockets as they looked.

Today some people call Mr. Bryan a "conservative" and nobody is afraid of him.

Governor Woodruff sent him a cordial letter of invitation to visit the state capitol and every republican of the house and senate voted for a resolution asking him to address the general assembly in "joint session convened."

Is the Bryan of today the same Bryan the students hooted, republicans shunned and thousands of democrats deserted in 1896?

Has something happened to Mr. Bryan?

Or has something happened to a lot of other people?

Has republican sentiment and democratic sentiment changed, or has the Hon. Archibald McNeil of Bridgeport hypnotized Governor Woodruff, the senate, the house and the "whole blooming business," as George M. Clark of Haddam would say?

Mr. Bryan was received with honor, Mr. Gunn of Milford, who took the stump against him eleven years ago, acted as a ticket seller for the Bryan banquet, and Governor Woodruff gave the conquering "Prince of Peace" his rooms in the Garde hotel.

Perhaps Mr. Bryan, all alone in his own room, didn't snicker today.

If he didn't he must have supreme control over his feelings.—New Haven Leader.

Tired but cheery, Mr. Bryan was human and humorous throughout his too short visit to Hartford yesterday, and that made his presence thoroughly delightful for all those who met him. Even in the printed word, where the sole charm is in what he said, and not in the genial skill with which he said it, we think that those who peruse his Garde hotel speech will find their full reward. Mr. Bryan has ripened wonderfully; and the attitude of an observant citizen of the world, with underlying political tendencies, which he took here, has become wholly natural to him, and is wholly charming in any case. We hope that Hartford pleased him as much as he pleased Hartford.—Hartford Courant.

THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Connecticut political conditions are not the same this morning they were yesterday morning. Something of very serious import—with far-reaching consequences in it—has occurred in Connecticut. An honest governor, thwarted and mocked in his unselfish efforts for the people's good, has done what Hughes of New York said he would do in like case; he has turned, directly and fearlessly, to the people. Such a speech as Rollin S. Woodruff made at New Haven last night is an absolutely new thing in the state's experience, but when was there ever before such occasion and provocation for it? The governor was far too much in earnest last night to smooth and soften his words; they have a sledge-hammer bluntness and impact.

He tells the people of Connecticut plainly that the present general assembly—with, as he believes, a majority of honest, well-meaning men in it—is controlled by the "leaders" and the lobby and the forces of graft and private profit in the background, issuing orders to both. He tells them that the session so far has been a juggling with legislation. He tells them that he despairs of the enactment at this time of a single law in their interest. "What a deplorable spectacle is presented to our view," he exclaims, "of the law-making power of this commonwealth paralyzed by the grip of lobbyists! How long will Connecticut stand for this?"

Such words from the lips of a chief magistrate whom the people respect, have not dropped void and inert to the ground. Governor Woodruff thinks they will be remembered when the delegates to the republican state convention are chosen, and we hope he is right. Everybody concerned may be entirely sure that Connecticut's electorate will remember them on election day. Long before that the speech made at New Haven last evening will have been read by every intelligent voter in the eight counties. "The time is coming," said Mr. Bryan at the capitol yesterday, "when an indignant people will say that politics must be honest." Coming it is, to a certainty; in Connecticut it is now almost at the door.

We have just quoted an eloquent American of these

years; the date at the top of the page recalls a very eloquent, very noble American of other years, and his words may well go to the freemen of Connecticut with Governor Woodruff's words and Mr. Bryan's. "Wherever party spirit shall strain the ancient guarantees of freedom," said George William Curtis on an earlier April 19; "or bigotry and ignorance shall lay their fatal hands upon education; or the arrogance of caste shall strike at equal rights; or corruption shall poison the very springs of national life—there, minute-men of liberty, are your Lexington Green and Concord Bridge; and, as you love your country and your kind, and would have your children rise up and call you blessed, spare not the enemy!"—Hartford Courant.

MR. BRYAN'S SERMON

There will be no dissent among those who listened to Mr. Bryan's talk in Court Square theatre yesterday—and none were for a moment inattentive—from the statement that he is a preacher of remarkable power and helpfulness. The essentials of life and conduct—those things that make for individual peace, usefulness and honor, for helpfulness in the personal contact, in the community and state and national relationships, as in all these things we are bound together as citizens—these were his theme. He touched upon the great drama of life at many points, to illumine at all, and in each to reinforce the need for individual consecration, for the right choice as to purpose and conduct, the attitude toward God which each human soul must face, and where character or the lack of it begin and flow out to make the man what he is.

It is much when a public character upon whom so many political hopes have centered, and who is without challenge a remarkable American, discusses thus, with a sincerity that is manifest, the roots of character and conduct with the youth of a city. The process helps to establish not only respect for religious truth and life, but to invite to the practice of that which is honorable

and of good report. Differ as men will with Mr. Bryan in politics, no good citizen failed to get from his address an impulse that should abide beyond the hour. In his speaking and lecturing the man has found a work that not only embodies the best ideals of citizenship, but he possesses an art of persuasion that must work good in inviting to reverent thought and faithfulness in service all along the line. Mr. Bryan in this is a helpful citizen of the republic, whatever his political future may be.

It is evidence of character and strength when higher public service is not dependent upon public office, and of lay preaching such as Mr. Bryan's we need more and not less. The message of the pulpit can gain converting power in secular lips as it is seen that the ideals of the "sacred office" are convertible into terms of everyday good citizenship—that it pays best to invite peace of soul through honesty of service, and that the life and words of Jesus Christ still constitute the great solvent of problems that vex the community, the nation and the great family of nations.—Springfield, Mass., Republican.

LINCOLN'S DEMOCRATIC MAYOR

Mayor Francis W. Brown, who for two years past has held the office of chief executive of Lincoln, has been re-elected. Mr. Brown is a democrat, and while Nebraska's capital city is republican on a partisan vote, the democrats of the city are feeling quite jubilant over Mayor Brown's re-election. While Mr. Brown's victory is largely a personal one, still the vote shows a very material gain in democratic strength. It need scarcely be added that Mr. Bryan is enjoying the election returns. Mayor Brown was one of the leaders of the movement which took a Nebraska delegation to New York to meet Mr. and Mrs. Bryan on their return from abroad, and as the readers of The Commoner will remember, the mayor presided at the Lincoln reception. The Commoner proposes the health of Mayor Brown, Lincoln's democratic executive.

REPUBLICAN ADVICE

It is interesting to read the advice which republicans are now giving to the democrats. It recalls the early months of 1904. The democratic party was at that time the recipient of a great deal of unsolicited advice from republicans, and it was all along the same line. The democrats were assured that their defeats were attributable to radicalism and that they could strengthen their party by a return to conservative doctrines. They were not promised victory, of course not, but the republican editors were so anxious to have a strong, virile organization to fight that we were assured that the republican party was becoming careless because it had no effective opposition and that it would really be good for the country to have the democratic party almost, but not quite, strong enough to win a victory. It would keep the republican party on its good behavior, make it careful about its conduct, etc. This kind of advice was given in unstinted measure, and it was followed. We had an eminently respectable candidate; he had the confidence of the business interests, and his campaign was conducted upon thoroughly conservative lines, and then the republicans sat back and laughed at the success of their scheme as they counted up a majority almost too large for figures.

Now the same game is being tried again. The republican editors are again pleading for the democratic party; they are weeping over its supposed decrepitude. Well, it is bad enough for the republican editors to advise us. There is possibly some excuse for them. The president is not taking their advice in the management of the republican party, and they feel that they are entitled to advise some organization, but it is adding insult to injury to have advice from General Charles H. Grosvenor—"the sage of Athens," as the Cincinnati Enquirer calls him. The Enquirer found him at the Sinton hotel. He picked out a democratic candidate and gave him a boost. Here is a sample of his advice:

"There is no way under heaven and among men whereby this country will trust the democratic party again with power in all the branches of the government,

until there is a radical reformation in the principles of the party and the personnel of its leaders. What good would come of carrying the southern states for a democratic candidate in 1908 with such accidental victories in other states as might possibly occur? The great body of the electorate is dead against the democratic party as it stands today, and it must have a guarantee of principle and not a guarantee of opportunity.

"How is a better result to be brought about? A republican of unfaltering faith in his party, and a lack of faith in the democratic party, ought not, perhaps, to give any advice, and surely his advice will not be counted as of any value by our democratic friends. Nevertheless, it would be the part of wisdom for the democratic party to turn its back upon the past, with a single statement to the people of the country as follows: 'We have tried a number of experiments and they have failed. We will now retreat from the disorder of the skirmish line, which has been so fatal to us on so many occasions, and fall back to the interior line of democratic ideas, principles and history. We will demand that the politics of the ancient democracy, so far as they are applicable today, shall be adopted as the cardinal principles of latter day democracy. It shall have those fundamental ideas reiterated, the abandonment of which has led us so far into the wilderness of defeat and demoralization. We will enact a platform embodying democratic principles; we will adopt democratic ideas upon every living topic of today's politics and we will ask the people of this country to retrace their steps from the conditions of the present and cast anchor again in the deep water upon the safe anchorage of democratic ideas.'

"Let the democratic party do this and then let them name a democrat, a man whose record is not all honeycombed with the taint of modern radicalism, and let them rally the people of the country as best they can to the support of the democratic party thus reorganized. And then you say, what will be the effect of that? The answer is easy. Defeat in 1908. What of it? It will be defeat with honor. A defeat with honor is curable; a defeat with dishonor is hard to rally from. It will be no worse than the party has been enacting for the past

twelve years and it will not be any worse than the party is absolutely facing, if it continues its present absurd career."

The democratic party will not take advice from its enemies. The president has shown how popular democratic doctrines are when sporadically adopted and spasmodically applied. The democratic party will show how much more popular those ideas are when consistently presented and persistently adhered to. If there ever was a time when the democrats can afford to be democratic, it is now; if there ever was a time when it was foolish to let the republican leaders control democratic policies and plan a democratic campaign, it is now.

Democracy must mean something; it must go forward; it must protect the rights of the people; it must improve the present opportunity to emphasize the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none—a doctrine which the republican party has violated until such great fortunes have been accumulated under favoritism and special privilege that a republican president is compelled to sound a note of warning.

THE INDEPENDENCE LEAGUE

The New York American, answering a recent editorial in The Commoner, charges the democratic party with being unable to rid itself of leaders who are "fortified in their control of the party by the money of the corporations that own them." While The Commoner will not admit the truth of every indictment made by the American it concedes that there are some corporation agents who are prominent in the democratic councils, but it asserts that the democratic party is sound at heart and that a large majority of the members of the party are incorruptible. The reactionary influences obtained control of the St. Louis convention and ran the campaign on conservative lines, but if the conservatives sinned "grievously," "grievously" did they "answer for it." The experience taught its lesson and that lesson will not be soon forgotten. It is in the power of the

rank and file to retire unfaithful leaders and those leaders will be retired. Out of the six and a half millions who voted the democratic ticket in 1896 and 1900 but a few are under the domination of predatory wealth—shall the rank and file then desert the party and found a new organization? If parties could be organized easily it might be advisable for the masses to form themselves into a new party and leave the leaders with no followers, but the organization of a new party is not an easy matter. It takes a great crisis to bring a great party into existence. The republican party grew out of a struggle gigantic enough to produce a civil war and it would not have been possible to form the republican party then if any existing party had been willing to undertake the work that the people wanted done.

Today the democratic party is prepared to meet the encroachments of plutocracy, and the president has revealed a reform element in the republican party which is daily becoming more and more persistent, and this reform element will act with the democrats if the republican leaders dare to take a backward step in 1908. Because people want results these reform republicans will act with the democrats if the democrats do their duty, and the chances are that the members of the Independence League will, too, for the sincerity of men is judged by their acts and sincere reformers will not wait indefinitely for their own organization to bring reforms that another organization is in position to bring at once. The populists endorsed the democratic ticket in 1896 and 1900. Why? Because they could not refuse to do so without putting their party organization above their principles. And so in 1908 if the democratic party does what it ought to do—and what The Commoner believes it will do—the members of the Independence League will have no excuse for voting a separate ticket. The democratic party is on trial now, but the Independence League will be on trial if it fights the democratic party when that party is fighting on the people's side. When that test comes Mr. Hearst and his papers and the Independence League will be allies of the democratic party—their past and their principles compel it.

IS THIS CALAMITY?

The Central Law Journal, published at St. Louis, prints this somewhat remarkable editorial:

"Due process of law is government itself. This being true it necessarily follows that the power of the president of the United States to appoint federal judges, is the greatest function of his exalted office; when this function is in any degree departed from, to that extent the president shirks his greatest responsibility. Political custom has been ushered into the secret places of the most high, and THE RESULT IS A PROSTITUTION OF ONE OF THE MOST SACRED PROVISIONS OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION. This has come about by gradual process, until the evil has become so intrenched, that even the big club of the president will have to be wielded with tremendous force to drive this custom to Hades, where it came from, to undermine the most important function of our government. The constitution of the United States came from the people; it is vox populi. To allow senators and congressmen to pay their political debts, by permitting them to select the federal judges, we say, is nothing short of the prostitution of the most important function of the presidential office. So long as we have good and learned men in the seats of the federal judges, the nation will be safe for upon them depends the due process of law. THERE WAS NEVER A TIME WHEN THE IMPORTANCE OF HAVING GOOD AND LEARNED MEN ON THE FEDERAL BENCHES NEEDED EMPHASIZING MORE THAN THE PRESENT. THERE NEVER HAS BEEN A TIME WHEN THE MATERIAL SELECTED, AS A GENERAL RULE, WAS WORSE. This is a matter so generally recognized by the members of the bar that it is not necessary to cite cases. We find the worst situations in the territories. It is true that there are many good federal judges, but these do not make up for the poor material found in many other places. We can only judge of the value of a custom by comparing its good and bad results. The results on the whole are so bad, there should be no hesitation on the part of the president in taking

upon himself the whole responsibility of seeing to it that the right kind of material is selected for the bench. In the case of the election of judges the people must be instructed as to the importance of having well trained men for these most responsible positions. The greatest lack of foresight is shown in the provision in the constitution of Oklahoma regarding the salary for the supreme judges. It provides $4,000 a year and the result is that those best able to hold such positions cannot afford to give up their practice to take them. But if the president of the United States has lost sight of his greatest responsibility and does not seem to appreciate the great need of giving the most careful and thoughtful consideration to the appointment of the federal judiciary, is it strange that the people should not see the importance of selecting and providing the means which will enable them to acquire the best ability to be had?

"There is no surer way of undermining the foundations of a republic than to leave such appointments to politicians, who use the confidence reposed in them to pay off political obligations, or give the office to some relative who is wholly incapable of filling the office, and when such abuse and even worse abuse is applied to the federal judiciary we have the greatest possible menace to the foundations of our government.

"With what fearful force comes the language of Mr. Justice Grier, in the case of Marshall vs. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad company, 16 How. l. c. 335 (57 U. S.), and what a picture of existing conditions. 'Influences secretly urged under false and covert pretenses must necessarily operate deleteriously on legislative action, whether it be employed to obtain the passage of private or public acts. Bribes in the shape of high contingent compensations, must necessarily lead to the use of improper means and the exercise of undue influence. Their necessary consequence is the demoralization of the agent who covenants for them; he is soon brought to believe that any means which will produce so beneficial a result to himself are "proper means;" and that a share of these profits may have the same effect of quickening the perceptions and warming the zeal of influential or care-

less members in favor of his bill. The use of such means and such agents will have the effect to subject the state governments to the combined capital of wealthy corporations, and produce universal corruption, commencing with the representative and ending with the elector. Speculators in legislation, public and private, a compact corps of venal solicitors, vending their secret influences, will infest the capitol of the union and every state, till corruption shall become the normal condition of the body politic, and it will be said of us as of Rome—'Omne Romae venale.'

"Unless the presidents of the United States rise to this responsibility the whole federal judiciary will be under the influence of the money powers. The salvation of the nation depends upon the kind of men who are given the responsibility of duly administering its laws. The importance of great laws was shown in our last week's issue in the quotation from the Antigone of Sophocles, and the maxim Lex non exacte definit sed arbitrio boni viri permittit. Great and good men will make and enforce great laws; and these 'make a state.' "

The Central Law Journal says: "There was never a time when the importance of having good and learned men on the federal benches needed emphasizing more than the present. There never has been a time when the material selected, as a general rule, was worse." It will not be necessary for the president to use "the big club" to bring about a reform in this respect. Let the president refuse to appoint inferior men or corporation henchmen; let him insist upon the nomination of men whose public and private record will bear the closest scrutiny. If the appointments are bad the president is to blame.

GOOD FOR THE PRESIDENT!

Upon the back of the statement relating to William Anderson's case, President Roosevelt wrote: "I think Anderson's years of life as an honest citizen, hard working and of good repute, warrant us in commuting his sentence at once or in pardoning him outright."

Good for the president! The ends of justice will not be served by keeping this man in prison. According to the testimony of his neighbors, he has reformed and when President Roosevelt surrenders him to his faithful wife and his little daughter, the American people will say "Amen" with practical unanimity.

EASILY ANSWERED

The Washington Post is guilty of an inexcusable blunder in the discussion of the initiative and referendum. It says:

"If all the power, subtlety and craft of the human mind should conspire to invent a scheme by which to work destruction to the plan of dual government that has existed in this republic for more than a century, the initiative and referendum would be invoked. Nothing could be more effectual and nothing could be so insidious. Government by constitutional construction would do the work like a meat axe; the initiative and referendum would operate as the poisoned draught, and thus we may choose the block or the cup as the instrument of political death. Both are complete consolidation. Both would totally extirpate state sovereignty. The dual form would be spared by constitutional construction, but it would be only the shadow. Even the shadow would cease to remind us of departed liberty under the irresponsible despotism of the initiative and referendum. In the constitution it is writ that New York and Delaware are equal in the United States senate. Under the initiative and referendum Delaware and Albany county, New York, would be equal, the county, with 44,478 votes, having a slight advantage over Delaware, with 43,878 votes. The entire state of New York has 1,617,770 votes, and thus under the fad of the initiative and referendum New York would have more than thirty-nine times the weight in the government that Delaware would have. Pennsylvania and Virginia are equal in the federal senate, but under the initiative and referendum Pennsylvania would swallow up half a dozen Virginias. Ohio

would equal four or five Tennessees, and Illinois would overshadow nineteen Mississippis. Could anybody conceive a scheme more effectual to consolidate political power in the great and populous states? In 1904 the four states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois cast 4,935,000 votes. The other states of the union —forty-one in number—cast 8,588,518 votes. As the constitution is, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois constitute four forty-fifths of the republic in the federal senate; under the initiative and referendum they would be more than one-third of the union. Where would the south stand? She would be as powerless in the grasp of the masses of the north as she was under the bayonets of reconstruction. Will the intelligence of America submit to the slums of our great cities for review the statesmanship that results from the deliberations of the representatives of the people? Is that to be an issue?''

The editor of the Post ought to know that, according to the constitution, the equal representation of the states in the senate cannot be changed without the consent of the states, and that means that it can never be changed. There is no danger, therefore, of the small states losing their influence. If the editor of the Post had taken occasion to inform himself before writing the editorial above quoted, he would know that the advocates of the initiative and referendum have never thought of depriving the states of their equal representation. In the plans applying the initiative and referendum to the federal government, the rights of the states are respected, and a vote to be binding would have to be concurred in by a majority of the states as well as by a majority of the people. The Post's scare is therefore not only without foundation but ridiculously absurd. It was not necessary for it to parade its knowledge of the population of Albany county and Delaware and its passionate appeal to the south is an insult to the intelligence of that section. The south will get tired after awhile of being treated by the plutocratic press as if it had no sense at all. The voters of the south are intelligent. They know the constitution and they also understand the principles of government. They believe in a democratic form of

government, and they do not need to study the subject of government at the feet of the Washington Post. The manner in which the suggestions of the trust-controlled papers have been rejected by the people of the south is proof that they not only know what they want but that they know why so many of our large dailies use misleading editorials. They know that the owners of these papers are attempting to chloroform their readers while the beneficiaries of special privilege are picking the pockets of those readers.

The small states are not afraid of the initiative and referendum. Montana, Oregon and South Dakota are small states, and yet, their people have already declared themselves in favor of the initiative and referendum. Oklahoma is not a large state, and yet, the initiative and referendum are a part of the constitution. Maine is not a large state, and yet her people vote at the next election upon the adoption of the initiative and referendum. New Jersey is not a large state, and yet one branch of her legislature came within four votes of endorsing the initiative and referendum.

No, the small states need not be afraid of the initiative and referendum, for whenever it is applied to the federal government the rights of the small states will be protected as securely as they are now protected by the constitution—they could not be disregarded.

The Post says that "the south would be as powerless in the grasp of the masses of the north as she was under the bayonets of reconstruction." The north would have no greater relative influence under the initiative and referendum than she has now, but the people both north and south would have more influence over their government, and that is why such a bitter protest is made by those who distrust the people.

The Post says: "Will the intelligence of America submit to the slums of our great cities for review the statesmanship that results from the deliberations of the representatives of the people?" So it seems that, according to the Post, it is the duty of the representatives to do the thinking for the people and if the representatives betray the people, the voters are not allowed to express themselves. The betrayal of the public by city

councils has led to the adoption of the initiative and referendum for the protection of the people of the cities. The betrayal of the people by state legislators has led to the adoption of the initiative and referendum in several states, and the contemptuous indifference of the United States senate to the wishes of the voters is operating in the nation as the action of legislatures and city councils has operated in state and city.

"LET THE PEOPLE RULE"

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH AT BANQUET GIVEN BY PEOPLE'S LOBBY AT NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, MAY 1, 1907

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I shall speak until half past one—

A Voice—As long as you like.

Mr. Bryan—I am informed that you have to take the cars over here at past past one—

A Voice—Or walk home.

Mr. Bryan—And I do not want to talk after the cars leave.

I would thank you for waiting so long, and would appreciate it as a compliment to me if I did not know that you have been entertained by speeches during this long wait and have thus been well repaid for the waiting.

I am very glad, indeed, to take part in a non-partisan demonstration of this kind. I have so many opportunities to be partisan that I welcome an opportunity to be non-partisan, although I am not sure that I need to make much change in my speech.

I find it very difficult to be partisan now even when I want to be, for if I make a straightout democratic speech, the first thing I know the president makes one of the same kind and then the subject immediately becomes non-partisan.

I was at a banquet at Washington two years ago last January where the president was the chief guest. It was a banquet given by the Gridiron club and that club, as you know, is made up of newspaper men and they

are the brightest men we have in the country. The Gridiron club banquet is, I think, the most delightful thing of the kind in the world. It is the custom at such banquets to spring jokes upon the guests and at this banquet the newspaper men were joking the president about what he was taking from the democratic platform, and when it came my time to speak I referred to the matter also. I said that I had not felt so good in Washington for years as I did then, to find that things that I had been advocating—and had been called an anarchist for advocating—had been made respectable by being advocated in high places; I enumerated several things that had been taken from our platform, but assured the banqueters that I did not speak of these things in a complaining way. Our platform was made for use and if we cannot get a chance to use it, we are glad to have anyone use it who will.

It rejoices me to see our opponents joining with us in the support of these reforms. It rejoices me so much that if I cannot take back what I have said about the republicans I do not feel like saying it again. In fact, I am about in the position of the young fellow who courted his girl for a year before he had the courage to propose to her; one evening he made bold to tell her that he loved her and to ask her to marry him. She was a very frank sort of a girl and replied: "Why, Jim, I have been loving you for all these many months and I have just been waiting for you to tell me so that I could tell you." Jim was overcome with delight; in the fulness of his joy, he went out and, looking up at the stars, exclaimed: "O Lord, I hain't got nothin' agin noboby." That is the way I am beginning to feel, and it is mighty nice to feel that way after so many exciting campaigns.

I am glad to come over into New Jersey and join with these democrats and republicans who are more interested in carrying out an idea than they are in winning a barren victory for any party. I am glad that there is a contest in the republican party between the reformer and the standpatter. It is a good sign and I can view this contest with more complacency than I did the same kind of a contest in our party.

Now, I am a believer in harmony; I am very fond of it. I am a friend of harmony, for I have learned the value of it by its absence in my party during recent campaigns. But harmony is not the most valuable thing a party can have and it is a more difficult thing to secure than some think. When I find that a group of people boast that they think alike, I conclude that they do not think at all, for when people think differences of opinion appear. A party can be perfectly harmonious if there is only one person in the party, but even then the vote must be taken at once, for he may change his mind. If there are as many as two persons in the party, you cannot expect harmony because one will be radical and the other conservative. There are eighty millions of radicals in this country, if you take the opinion of the most conservative man in the nation; and there are eighty millions of conservatives if you take the opinion of the most radical man. Radicalism and conservatism are relative terms. That which is radical today may be conservative tomorrow. It is necessary to have both radicals and conservatives; but for the conservatives the radicals would go too fast, and without the radicals the conservatives would not go at all. The radical suggests, the conservative investigates. The radical makes a suggestion and his suggestion is not heeded, and a little later he makes his suggestion a second time, and if that suggestion is not heeded, later on he makes the suggestion again, and so on, and each time the conservative says no, and finally the radical drags the conservative on.

When I was in Japan I saw two lions, two Korean lions, that stood in front of the doors of the temple; they are not fierce looking lions, but rather comical looking. One represents the positive and one the negative —they represent the eternal conflict between the radical and the conservative. I brought them home with me and have them on either side of my porch steps, and when I go up the porch steps I walk as nearly as I can in the center between the two.

Progress is between the two extremes. We are now having a contest in the republican party between the radical and the conservative, and no doubt the radical

will finally win. There is only one place in the world for the standpatter—that is in the grave; that is the only place he is at home, for everything that has life lives, and if it has intelligence as well as life it moves forward. There is no such thing as standing still. If the republican party dared to stand still for ten years it would not hold power in a single state unless it be New Jersey. In fact—there is some prospect here of progress, but, to be frank with you, I think this is one of the least hopeful states we have. But we have to go forward, and the party that does not go forward is going to be left in the struggle, and in the contest now waging between reform and the standpat republican, there is no doubt about which is going to win. If your standpatters are going to control the policies of that party, it is bound to die. The only hope of any party is in a progressive movement.

Lincoln spoke on the battlefield of Gettysburg of the unfinished work of those who died there. Every generation finds the work of the last unfinished; every generation leaves to the next an unfinished work—everywhere the work of government is in the line of bringing the government nearer to the people. I believe in everything that tends to bring the government nearer to the people and to give the people larger control over their government. I am in favor of the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, because it brings them nearer to the people. And if any of you doubt that the feeling is growing in favor of broader democracy, let me tell you the history of this country on that subject.

It was over one hundred years after the constitution of these United States was adopted before a protest against the present method of electing senators reached the point where there was an expression on the subject in the congress—a little more than a hundred years—and yet in 1892 the Fifty-second congress adopted a resolution proposing the necessary amendment to the constitution for that purpose. That was fifteen years ago. After one hundred years of waiting, during which time first one and then another, and then a few more, were advocating this reform, the sentiment became

strong enough to secure the passage of a resolution through congress, and in the last fifteen years that resolution has passed five times through the popular branch of the federal congress.

Twice the congress was democratic and three times the congress was republican. But if any republican boasts because his party passed it three times and ours only twice, let me tell him that ours passed it twice before the republicans passed it at all, and we would have passed it oftener, but we have only had but two congresses, and two republican congresses adjourned without acting upon the resolution that two democratic congresses had already passed.

At last the sentiment grew so strong that a republican congress acted favorably, eight years after a democratic congress had set the example. But I am willing that they should follow even eight years behind the democrats. Nearly two-thirds of the states have acted, and I think nearly as many republican as democratic states have acted favorably. Eighteen states are now electing their senators as nearly by direct vote as they can under the constitution, and of these eighteen states ten are democratic and eight republican.

So you see that democratic sentiment is broader than any party. I am glad that the democratic sentiment in this country is too large for any party to monopolize.

If a man trusts the people he is willing to let the people have their own way. If he does not trust the people he is always trying to build up a system between the people and their officials, and the less confidence he has in the people the more system he wants.

I never think of this system without thinking of the story I heard when I was a boy, a story connected with St. Louis. A peddler went to a six-story building, and when he began to open his pack on the first floor, he was sent to the second floor, and when he commenced to open his pack on the second floor, he was sent to the third floor and so on to the sixth floor, and when he went to open his pack there the floorwalker took him by the coat collar and the slack of his breeches and sent him down one flight of the stairs, and when he landed there he was thrown down another flight of stairs, and

so on until finally, when he got out into the street, he turned around and looked up at the building and said: "My, what a system they have in that place!"

Now a man who does not trust the people is always wanting some system built up, but the man who does trust the people is willing for the people to have what they want in government.

Now we are going to get election of our senators by direct vote; it is bound to come; I have no doubt of it whatever. I am confident that it is right, and that which is right will always triumph in the end. It takes time for right to triumph, but it triumphs at last, and we are going on applying fundamental principles until we get this government where the people will control it absolutely.

One of the most important reforms in this direction is known as the initiative and the referendum.

I am glad that I can speak on this subject in this presence without alarming the people. I spoke of it in Brooklyn the other night and I was surprised to find next morning that some papers featured it as if it was the only thing I had said during the evening. I made a speech there of two hours, and this was only an illustration of the principle I tried to present to the people in the line of representative government. Then some of the New York papers talked about it as if it was a perfectly new idea—as if I was trying to smuggle in something from abroad without paying duty on it. I am going to wait until they get over their scare and then I am going to tell them that it was in the democratic national platform six years ago—they ought to know what was done after all this length of time.

Of course, I know it takes an idea a good while to get from the west down east—I don't know but we ought to have a fast train for the express purpose of carrying ideas from the west to the east for the benefit of the editors of the New York newspapers. But wouldn't you suppose that the platform adopted at Kansas City six years ago last summer would, by this time, have gotten down here and be reasonably well known in the east? And I am bringing in a new idea! Why, my friends, it

was in the democratic platform in Nebraska four years before it got into the national democratic platform.

Ten years ago last summer the democratic state convention of Nebraska adopted a platform favoring the initiative and referendum. Before you people knew my name, before any of you even suspected my being connected with the democratic nomination for president, we were endorsing this doctrine in Nebraska, and I was chairman of the committee on resolutions when it was done.

But even out there we had editors who were sort of an abridged edition of the New York editors, and the editor of the republican paper in my home town said that when I read that plank about the initiative and referendum the democrats looked at each other in surprise and that one democrat said to another: "What is that?" And the other democrat replied: "Why, that is a new kind of democratic drink." And according to that republican paper, it went through unanimously then. Ten years ago last summer a republican editor was making fun of the initiative and referendum and speaking as if it were a new kind of democratic drink.

But, my friends, if it were really a new kind of drink I believe it would be more popular in some quarters than it is. That idea is growing and will grow. State after state has adopted that idea. You came within four votes, I am informed, of passing a resolution in its favor through one branch of your legislature. Up in Maine, which I have always regarded as more or less an eastern state, they are to vote on it at the next election. And so it is growing all over the country. I do not see how any argument can be urged against it.

If a man believes in the right of the people to govern themselves, how can he object to the initiative and referendum?

Now there are some people who have a false idea of government; there are some people who think that a representative is elected to think for the people. But that is not our theory. Our theory is that people think for themselves and that the representative is elected to act for the people and carry out what the people think.

I might give you an illustration of the fact that we

recognize that. Why do we have platforms if we elect men to think for us? Why hamper them with what we think? Why not leave them free to think as they please? When platforms are written the writers of them recognize the right of the voter to have a representative in harmony with the views of the voter. And so, I believe that the time has come when we should bring our government closer to the people and give the people a more complete control of their government.

Now let me digress for a moment to say that there is an idea of leadership in this country that is misleading. It is not the duty of the leader to think for the people; the leader thinks with the people, not for the people. Someone—I think it was ex-Governor Oglesby, of Illinois—said that a leader is one who is going in the same direction with the people, but a little bit ahead, and it is the best definition of a leader that I know of. He must be going in the same direction and he must be a little bit ahead of the people or he will not be leading them, and the only way to select a leader is to select the one who says what the people want said, and who says it better than the people themselves can say it.

The molder of public opinion is like the molder of bullets. The molder of bullets does not make the lead; he simply puts the lead in form for use. So the molder of public opinion does not create the opinion; he simply gives it form that makes that opinion more effective. The man who attempts to create an opinion that the people oppose, ceases to be a leader. We have had in this country many instances of men who have supposed themselves to be leaders, and yet when they have looked around they have found themselves walking all alone.

We have seen this in both parties, and I do not know anything more pathetic in public life than to have a leader with no people following him, and the people will not follow him unless he goes in the direction they want him to go. The leader is not nearly so important as the people themselves. I believe in organization but, my friends, the organization is not as important as the voter. I remember a campaign in Nebraska when a party arose, and without any previous organization, in one campaign

secured enough voters to make it almost a tie with the other two parties. Power comes from the people; it comes up to the leader from those for whom he speaks, and he only speaks for those who want him to speak for them and they want him to say what they want said.

One of the New York newspapers, discussing the initiative and referendum, said that they have only used the initiative and referendum in Switzerland a few times in twenty-five years.

Well, that is an argument in favor of it, not against it, for one of the advantages is that even after you get these things you do not have to use them; but if you do not have them you frequently need to use them. Why don't you need to use them? Because, if the people have the initiative, they have a system whereby they can compel the submission of anything they want to vote on and when disobedience is useless the representative is more sure to obey.

And if the people have the referendum, which is a process by which they sit in judgment on what their representatives do, then the representatives know that the people can veto their acts, and that if they do pass laws that the people do not want the people will veto them. The beauty of this system is that it gives you power, and yet you do not always have to use the power; the possession of it is in itself a great protection.

And why shouldn't the people have what they want; why shouldn't the people have the veto power? Does not your governor veto the acts of your legislature? And if one man can veto an act of the legislature, why shouldn't the people, who elect the governor and the legislature, have the right of veto if they do not want a particular law?

I read the other day in the New York Tribune an editorial on the Oklahoma constitution, and the great objection to it, according to that editor, was that it was written by cornfield lawyers—now get that right—I was about to say corn-fed lawyers the other day, but that is not it—I mean cornfield lawyers—that's what it said. Now I read that Oklahoma constitution, and I say to you that it is the best constitution in the United States today. I was interested to find how carefully those cornfield

lawyers had puttied up the holes that the trust-fed lawyers had been making in other constitutions. It was really interesting to see how carefully these cornfield lawyers, looking at the question from the standpoint of the common people, had corrected the things that had been found weak in the constitutions of other states, and the best thing in that constitution is the provision for the initiative and referendum.

Now no matter what mistakes you make in your constitution, if you give the people power to correct the mistakes they will correct them. No matter how bad your laws may be, if the people have the power to make them good they will make them good, and the most important provision that you can have in a constitution is a provison that places in the hands of the people power to correct the constitution and make it keep pace with progress and intelligence, and the initiative and referendum are the best things that we have found so far to bring the government near to the people and make it their government.

But you say the people make mistakes. Of course they make mistakes. But I think the people have the right to make their own mistakes. Others have made mistakes for them, and the people have been denied the privilege of correcting those mistakes. You cannot expect to have a government that is free from mistakes, because we are governed by human beings and they are not perfect. But there is this difference between mistakes that are made by the majority and mistakes that are made by the minority.

The majority never makes a mistake intentionally, for it never pays the majority to make a mistake. Whenever the majority finds out that it has made a mistake it corrects it, but if you have the minority ruling it is sometimes so profitable for the minority to make mistakes that they never want to correct them, and nearly every revolution in society has been an effort of the people to correct the mistakes of the minority. When you give the people the power to correct mistakes, you will find abuses corrected very quickly.

Now I do not want to appeal to the radical, but to the conservative, for if the conservative people of this coun-

try took an intelligent view of their own affairs it would not be necessary to make any other argument in favor of these reforms. If these conservative people were foresighted and took an enlarged view of their own interests, they would see the necessity of reform in our methods of government. Take the stream as an illustration; if the current is not obstructed there is no danger in it; you can stand and listen to the singing of the waters. But if you attempt to put a dam across the stream the water rises and presses against the dam; if you raise the dam higher the water rises higher yet, and after awhile there will be a force in that pent-up water that no dam made by human hands can long stay; and then the people who live in the valley below are in danger.

And so, my friends, if you let the people have their way there is no danger in any country, but if you dare to obstruct the will of the people there is always pressure behind the dam, and the more you raise the dam the greater is the pressure; if there is any danger now it is because predatory wealth has obstructed the will of the people for years.

The more freely you allow the people to rule, the more quickly will every abuse be remedied. If you scratch your finger and blood poisoning sets in your doctor tells you to cut the finger off and thus save the hand; if you wait he tells you to cut off the hand and save the arm, and if you still wait he tells you to cut off your arm in order that you may save your body. And so it is in the body politic; if you will give the people a government that they can control, if you let the people have their way they will reform every abuse as soon as they find it out. But if you dare obstruct the will of the people you simply invite more radical reform.

Ten years ago, when I was a candidate, I never mentioned government ownership of railroads, and six years ago I was so conservative that I never mentioned, either in writing or in speech, the possibility of government ownership of railroads, and yet so rapidly has public sentiment grown and so arrogantly have the great railroad corporations obstructed the will of the people that a republican president has, in two messages threatened

government ownership if the railroads did not get out of politics and allow the people to attend to their own business.

Is not that evidence of the truth of what I have said, that if you refuse mild remedies you must be prepared sooner or later to meet harsher remedies?

Now I believe in the initiative and referendum, and I have believed in them for years; and I have believed in them because I believe that they make it possible for the people to correct abuses whenever they want to correct them. This is the only way to save society from great convulsions for great remedies must be applied to great evils. I know of nothing that is milder as a reform than the initiative and referendum, and I want to encourage you in fighting for it, be you republicans or democrats.

If you are republicans do not object to it because you are told that the democrats advocated it first. Of course, we will boast a little. You cannot expect that we will not be human, and it is human to rejoice; but I will give you an answer to make to us: If we rejoice too much, if we accuse you of borrowing our ideas, don't cast it aside on that account; just tell us that we got it from the populists, and then we can't say much more about it. And the populists borrowed it from somebody.

But there is no patent on ideas; ideas belong to the world, and an idea once sent forth can never be withdrawn, for man has no ownership of ideas. And let us not refuse to accept a good idea because we did not originate it. We did not originate the telegraph system. For years man saw the lightning, but he saw in it nothing but a menace, but after a while someone conceived the idea—a great American— of bringing it down and making it of service to man, and it has been imprisoned in wires, and those wires now girdle the globe. We use this idea, and we do not feel badly because we did not originate it. So it is with all the great ideas that have been used in this great world. If we did not advance the idea first, let it be said of us that we adopted it as soon as we did see it; let it be said of us that we did not delay after we had a chance to adopt it.

The ideal and the idea belong to the world. You may

see a man living in a house so fine that you may never hope to have one like it—it may be entirely out of your reach; you may find one so well educated that you can never hope to be his equal in that respect; but, my friends, there is no one who has an ideal so high that you cannot hope to claim that ideal and make it as much yours as his.

And so with an idea. No man has any special ownership in an idea more than in an ideal, and there ought to be no feeling on the subject, because it belongs not to one party, but to the whole country. And if anything more need to be said to encourage you let me say that behind every truth there is an irresistible force. You find that the grain when it is put into the ground will send forth first the blade, then the stalk and then the full head; and when we find that is true the world around we conclude that back of that grain there is a power irresistibly and constantly at work and, my friends, the force that is back of truth—intellectual, moral and political—is just as irresistible and as constantly at work as the force that is behind the grain.

Go into any part of the world today and you will find that everywhere our theory of government has been planted, and you will find that everywhere it is growing. In Persia they have adopted the first constitution they ever had within the last two years. In Austria they are enlarging the basis of representation; and they are doing the same thing in Sweden at this same time. In England the great controversy is between the House of Lords and the House of Commons, and the House of Commons says that that hereditary body shall not defeat the will of the people.

China has sent envoys throughout the world to gather information for the forming of a constitution. Everywhere this leaven is at work; everywhere you will find two great parties, one struggling to bring the government nearer to the people, the other obstructing the way. Everywhere in the world the people's party is growing, and everywhere the party of the aristocracy is dying. And it is as true in this country as in every other country. If I did not have faith in the final triumph of right I could not fight for anything, but believing, as I do, that

every righteous principle will at last prevail, I can fight for it whether it triumphs in my day or not. I am glad if I can help the least little bit to hasten this victory even if it does not come until after I am dead.

And now I want to say just one thing in conclusion. I have been interested in politics for a good many years; I have been making political speeches for twenty-seven years; I have been acquainted with national politics for seventeen years, and I have never seen so much to encourage a man who believes in a government of the people, for the people and by the people, as I have seen within the last few years. Until recently I saw great campaign funds collected from corporations that contributed the money in order to purchase immunity or legislation, and the public conscience seemed dead.

It is more than ten years ago that Mr. Havemeyer, the president of the sugar trust, testified to campaign contributions before a committee of the United States Senate.

You remember that Mr. Havemeyer said, when they asked him if he or the sugar trust had contributed to the campaign funds, yes; and they asked, "To which party?" and he said, "That depends on circumstances." He was asked, "To which party did you contribute in New York?" and he replied, "The democratic party." "To which party did you contribute in Massachusetts?" he was asked, and he replied "The republican party." "To which party in New Jersey," he was asked, and he said, "Well, New Jersey is a doubtful state; I will have to look at the books."

Now that was the testimony of the head of the sugar trust, testimony given before a senate committee, and yet I will venture the assertion that not one person in a hundred in the state of New Jersey ever read it, or, if he read it, that it did not make an impression on his mind so that he would remember it. And so for years we saw elections bought and sold; for years we saw these great corporations controlling executives and legislatures for their own benefit and use—that's what we saw—and it seemed as if the people were indifferent.

But within the last three years what a change has taken place! Investigation has shown how the great

insurance companies contributed to campaign funds, money belonging to their policyholders, and we have been allowing men for years to make an improper use of funds in their hands, and at last the president of the United States has recommended the passage of a law that will prevent such contributions. I thank the president for what he has done in this respect. But I do not think he goes far enough. I am glad to have him go as far as he will, and then, standing on the vantage ground that he gives us, we will fight for better things until we drive the corporations out of politics.

It is a good thing for corporations to be prevented from contributing campaign funds. No one can defend corporation contributions to campaigns. The money belongs to the stockholders, not to the officers, and the officers have no right, moral or legal, to contribute political views. But that is not enough. We must go farther than that. If we stop there we will find these officers will get around it by using the money and covering it up so as not to violate the letter of the law. I believe the time has come when men who contribute any considerable sum should give their names and let the public know where the money comes from to carry on campaigns, for we have certain individuals with such large interests that even if they contribute out of their own pockets they could finance a campaign committee and give ten times as much as all the rest of the people. If they succeed in electing those they want, they can get ten times as much out of the people's pockets as they contribute.

So I say that it is necessary that we shall have the names of contributors of campaign funds. Nor is that enough. We must have publication, publication before the election so that the people may know what is going on. And, if necessary, we will have a law strong enough so it cannot but be effective. I am not satisfied to have the law provide for publication by the committee alone; I believe a man when he contributes should be compelled to give notice, so you can have him to check against the committee. And I would go further, and would make it a penal offense, for if there is anything that offends one's sense of justice it is to send a man to the penitentiary

for stealing a horse and not send a man to the penitentiary for stealing an election.

But, my friends, I was only calling attention to a few evidences of growth that encourage me to believe that better times are coming for those who want purity in politics and a government responsive to the will of the people.

And now let me give you what I regard as even a more encouraging sign; that is, the activity of the well-to-do men on the people's side of these questions, for these reforms have generally heretofore found their advocacy among the poor people. I regard it as a splendid sign that men of independent means, men who have no fear for themselves or for their own positions, are beginning to recognize that there is something in this world more important than the making of money, and that these men are beginning to give to these questions the benefit of their business experience and of their brain. In the last few years I have been gratified beyond measure to have men of means come to me and tell me of their interest in these reforms, altruistic interest, if you please, unselfish interest; men not seeking public office; men asking for nothing in the way of favors from the government, but men who recognize that this government must be better than it has been if we are to leave the legacy we ought to leave to our children.

I am glad, my friends, to find this increasing number, and I want to look upon these questions as these men do, for I am in an independent position. My poverty was overestimated when they called me poor just as my wealth is overestimated now, when they call me rich. I was never so poor that I could not have everything I needed, and my wants are as simple now, and my tastes as modest as when I was a struggling young lawyer and my wife and I were doing our work together. I have no fear about my income, no doubt that I can take care of myself, no doubt that I can leave my children as much as I think I ought to leave them. I do not believe in leaving children much. I am glad my father did not leave me much, for if I had grown up in anticipation of a fortune I would not have developed the industry that I did develop when I found that I had to make my own

living. I do not want my children to be spoiled by the expectation of a great deal of money; I shall be able to leave them enough.

Why should a man want to leave only money to his children? If you leave money it may take the wings of the morning and fly away. You must leave your children something better than money. There is a growing class in this country, an increasing number of our citizens who recognize that the best legacy a father can leave to his children, is not fortune, but a government that will protect his children in their enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and guarantee to them a fair share of the proceeds of their own toil.

I welcome, therefore, as allies in the great fight that we have before us, not only the poor who have felt the pressure of bad laws, also those well-to-do people whose hearts beat in sympathy with the hearts of the struggling masses; and I am glad to have these two classes stand side by side and fight shoulder to shoulder. The fact that they are doing it in increasing number is evidence of the truth of what Dumas wrote thirteen years ago and Tolstoy ten years ago. They declared the coming of an era of brotherhood.

I rejoice that I have lived to see this day when men of means are recognizing that the poor man is made in the image of the same God whose image the well-to-do man wears; that these men are recognizing that the poor man loves his children as much as the rich man loves his children. This recognition of kinship will enable us to solve these questions in the spirit of brotherly love and, solving them, give an impetus to progress and civilization.

OPPOSING OKLAHOMA STATEHOOD

Those who believe in the right of the people to govern themselves may well be astonished at the dispatches from Washington. It is stated with circumstantial detail that pressure is being brought to bear upon the president to persuade him to veto the constitution of the new state of Oklahoma. Three reasons are assigned: First,

that the constitution contains a provision for the initiative and referendum; second, that the districting of the state is not fair; and third, that the constitution contains more strict regulation of corporations than is to be found in most constitutions. The second and third objections would hardly be regarded by the president as sufficient to justify the denial of statehood to Oklahoma. While the constitution attempts to protect the people from injustice at the hands of corporations, none of the provisions are confiscatory or subject to serious objection. The corporations are allowed to ride roughshod over the people of so many states that the president would hardly dare to deny statehood to Oklahoma merely because the representatives of the people have attempted to protect themselves against corporate greed. The fact that the fight against the adoption of the constitution is being led by Mr. Asp, the Oklahoma attorney for the Santa Fe System, would embarrass the republicans, for they presented the railroad provisions of the constitution as a reason for rejecting a constitution which the representatives of the people prepared and which the people themselves endorsed.

The second objection is not likely to have much weight, because the districting under which the delegates to the constitutional convention were elected was more partisan and unfair than the present districting. It is to be regretted than any party will take advantage of its majority to district a state unfairly, (as the editor of The Commoner has not seen a map of the state as districted, he does not know whether the state has been gerrymandered or not) but surely, when the president has before him the map of the territory as it was gerrymandered by republican officials in the hope of capturing the constitutional convention, he will hardly feel like criticising anything that the democrats may have done.

According to the press dispatches the most violent objection is made to the provision for the initiative and referendum, but can the president give that as a reason for excluding Oklahoma from a part in the next presidential election? Oregon has been giving her vote to the republican ticket. Will he be in favor of excluding

the electors of Oregon on the ground that it has the initiative and referendum? South Dakota gave her electoral vote to the president two years ago, and she has adopted the initiative and referendum. Is this a reason for excluding her? Maine is going to vote on the question next year. Shall the rule be applied to Maine in case the people adopt the initiative and referendum?

It is asserted by some that the initiative and referendum destroys the representative character of the government, but such an argument will surely have no weight with a thoughtful person. We have always had the referendum in regard to constitutions, and there is a constantly increasing tendency to use the referendum in the government of cities. The law which called Oklahoma's constitutional convention together provided for a referendum vote on the constitution. Who will draw a line between the right of the people to veto a constitution and their right to veto a law enacted by a legislature?

It is not likely that the president will be undemocratic enough to interfere or to oppose any constitution which the people of Oklahoma deliberately endorse at the polls, but if he should venture to do so, the few electoral votes of Oklahoma kept out of the democratic column would be insignificant compared with the number of democratic votes which would be added to the democratic column from other states if the issue is directly presented, whether the people have a right to govern themselves. A rejection of Oklahoma's constitution might delay Oklahoma's statehood for a few months but it would prove a blow to republican prospects that no republican in official life would dare to strike.

ADVERTISING CONFIDENCE GAMES

Public attention is just now being directed to the advertising of certain speculative enterprises which are nothing less than confidence games. These advertisements are to be found in nearly all the papers and the promises held out are so obviously deceptive that the

business managers of the papers cannot be held guiltless.

Take, for instance, an advertisement which appeared in the New York Sun recently in which a trust company offered for sale a "limited" block of stock in an Alaskan gold mine. "Dividends of twenty-five per cent are assured from the first year's operation on the company's entire capitalization and thereafter as high as, and possibly more than, fifty per cent per annum."

If a paper published personal notices informing would-be confidence men where they could obtain counterfeit money it would scarcely participate more fully in a purpose to defraud. Mining is a legitimate industry even though the element of chance enters into it, but if it is advertised at all the advertisement ought to state the facts. A company which can assure twenty-five per cent dividends from the first year does not have to buy newspaper space to secure stockholders. It does not have to dispose of its stock at half price to people so far away from the mine that they cannot investigate. The same is true of stock in oil wells and gas wells. Stock which is advertised with great promises and sold remote from the place where the field of operation is—especially when "the price is to be advanced in the near future"—usually partakes of the nature of a lottery and should be so advertised. Such advertisements should read: "The Grand Digging in the Slim Chance Mine will take place soon and a few more tickets can be secured at ten dollars each. If paying ore is struck the purchasers may get their money back with interest—if not they will receive a large return in experience." Or "The Great Hopes Oil Well will be sunk shortly. Persons desiring tickets in this lottery can apply to———agents, who will receive their commission on sales whether oil is struck or not."

Such advertisements might not draw as many flies into the spider's web but they would be more honest than the advertisements which do appear in reputable papers.

The Commoner refuses to advertise STOCK IN ANY CORPORATION, first, because, as a rule, only speculative stock is advertised and, second, because the value of stock depends upon the management and the manage-

ment may change any day. A few have discontinued their subscriptions because their stock advertisements have been declined, but the readers have been protected. The Commoner has made its advertising pages valuable by guarding against fraud and misrepresentation. It invites its readers to report promptly any advertiser who does not live up to the strict letter of his advertisement. This ought to be expected of any paper, for no honest newspaper proprietor can afford to make money by deceiving confiding patrons. But The Commoner goes further; it will not knowingly assist a trust to drive its weaker rivals into bankruptcy, and it therefore refuses advertising from any corporation which controls more than fifty per cent of the product of any article which it offers for sale. This, of course, does not apply to articles protected by patents or copyright, for the law grants a monopoly for a limited time as a compensation for a new idea, or invention, but these are few in number. The numerous and hurtful monopolies are not founded upon patents—they are founded upon the power of large corporations to control the market and drive out competitors. As The Commoner opposes the principle of private monopoly and fights that principle whenever it appears, it will neither put itself under obligation to the trusts or assist them to crush out the struggling industries which are menaced by the great monopolies.

In thus discriminating against trusts The Commoner is not only protecting itself and the small business man, but it is protecting all of its readers, for the natural, if not the inevitable, result of monopoly is an increase in price after competition has been eliminated.

"GREEKS BEARING GIFTS"

Before the democrats shower their praises upon Senator Knox as defender of the rights of the states, let them carefully re-read the story of the Trojan Horse, which gave rise to the proverb, "Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts." The Trojan Horse, it will be remem-

bered, was presented as a gift but it was full of soldiers and the soldiers came forth at night and wrought the ruin of the besieged city.

Senator Knox is supported by representatives of predatory wealth and predatory wealth opposes all government regulation. The local representatives of the great corporations spend their time showing that all state regulation is an interference with interstate commerce, while the national representatives of these same corporations are employed to denounce national regulation as an infringement upon the reserved rights of the states. The object of predatory wealth is to assail every sort of restraint. At present it looks as if Senator Knox is the man selected by the railroads and trusts to protect them from federal prosecution and he is likely to become quite popular with those papers which get their inspiration from Wall Street. He will use the president's gushing endorsement of his cabinet work to win the support of those republicans who shout for "some one in harmony with President Roosevelt"—but DO NOT NAME HIM, while he can count on the support of every corporation that has its hands in the pockets of the people and, therefore, wants to "let well enough alone."

The democrats believe in protecting the rights of the states, but they will not be deceived by the effort now being made to use the state's right doctrine as a breastwork for the trusts when these trusts are attacked by congress. Democrats believe that the powers of both the state and the federal governments should be used for the protection of the people; men who engineer the Knox boom are opposed to governmental restraint whether that restraint is exercised by the state or by the nation.

FUTURES

The Wall Street Journal is becoming uneasy. It says: "For centuries the supreme question was how shall the great majority secure liberty and equality of opportunity against the power of the small privileged minority.

The time may come when the problem will be reversed, and when the question shall be how to preserve the rights of the small minority against the power of the great majority. Looking at it from every point of view the tyranny of a despotic majority can be more unjust and do more harm than the tyranny of a despotic minority."

The Journal is looking far into the future for trouble. So long as the American people provide, in their tariff, shelter for the trusts that oppress them; so long as they give to the national bankers the privilege of loaning the people's money to the people; so long as a handful of men are permitted to control the insurance business of the country and a coterie of "captains of finance" are permitted to manage the transportation business; so long as the trust magnates are allowed to fix the price the producer receives and the price the consumer pays; so long as every agency of man and of government—the farmer's product, the means of transportation, the state legislature, the congress and all too often the court itself—seems to have been created for the special use and benefit of men who neither toil nor spin, and so long as men who raise a voice in protest against these conditions are discouraged in their good efforts by the failure of their fellows to appreciate their labor, or by the attacks of an ignorant or a venal press—there is not great need for worry concerning "the tyranny of a despotic majority!"

Let the Wall Street Journal direct its attention to the undue power wielded in this country by "the small privileged minority."

DEATH CLAIMS TWO FRIENDS

Two esteemed friends, Hon. Albert Williams, of Ionia, Mich., and Hon. William Alford, of San Francisco, have recently been called to their reward.

The former lived to a ripe old age; the latter was cut off in his prime when life was full of promise.

Mr. Williams was one of the founders of the republican party but became a democrat in 1896 and has since

that time been conspicuous at all of the gatherings of our party in his state. Wise in council and trusted by all who knew him, he was a tower of strength to any cause which his conscience bade him espouse. He will be sorely missed by the democracy of Michigan and by the citizens of the entire state.

Mr. Alford was but forty-one years of age. Splendidly endowed by nature, he had carefully prepared himself for the large service which his generous heart prompted him to undertake. He had a genius for public affairs, and his sympathies led him in the very morning of his manhood to lay his great abilities at the feet of the common people. He thought clearly, spoke eloquently and acted courageously. In his death a popular tribune has fallen, and his increasing circle of friends bow in sorrow to receive the blow.

THE RAILROAD IN POLITICS

The Commoner takes pleasure in calling the attention of its readers to one of the most amusing instances of the railroad in politics that it has been its good fortune to discover. The following is a copy of the agreement which the Bangor & Aroostook railroad has made with the state of Maine:

An agreement made and entered into between the state of Maine, hereinafter called state of the first part, and the Bangor & Aroostook Railroad company, hereinafter called railroad company, of the second part: Witnesseth:

Whereas, Sections 4 and 5 of Chapter 122 of the Private and Special Laws of Maine of 1891, are in words and figures as follows:

(Section 4 and Section 5 quoted.)

And Whereas, Railroad company has acquired by lease for 999 years from April 1, 1892, the Bangor and Piscataquis railroad and its appurtenances extending from a point of connection with the Maine Central railroad in Old Town in Penobscot county to the foot of Moosehead Lake at West Cove in Greenville in Piscataquis county:

And Whereas, Railroad company has also acquired for a period of 999 years from July 1, 1887, the Bangor and Katahdin Iron Works railway and its appurtenances extending from a point of connection with said Bangor and Piscataquis railroad in Milo to the Katahdin Iron Works, both in said Piscataquis county:

And Whereas, Railroad company has built and equipped a line of railroad from a point of connection with the Bangor and Katahdin Iron Works railway in Brownville in said Piscataquis county through the towns of Houlton and Presque Isle to Caribou village to a branch line in the village of Fort Fairfield:

And Whereas, at a stockholders' meeting of said Railroad company, duly called for that purpose by a majority vote of said stockholders, this contract has been approved:

Now, Railroad company agrees to transport over its aforesaid lines of railroad, leased and built, troops and munitions of war, in times of war, insurrection or civil commotion, free of charge other than as herein and in said act provided, for a term of twenty years from February 27, 1891, and State on its part in consideration thereof promises annually during said twenty years to pay to Railroad company an amount equal to ninety-five per cent of the taxes collected in the corresponding year by State from Railroad company upon its said lines of railroad built and leased, and other real and personal property including its stock and franchise, also including that leased and in which it has acquired entire interest as aforesaid:

This contract being presented to the treasurer of the state of Maine, he, in pursuance of said section 4, executes this contract in behalf of the state; and Railroad company has caused this contract to be executed in its behalf by Alfred A. Burleigh, its president, in duplicate this 9th day of February, A. D., 1895.

The Bangor and Aroostook Company,
By Albert A. Burleigh, President.
Seal of the Bangor and Aroostook Company.
F. M. Simpson, Treasurer,
In behalf of the State of Maine.
Seal of the Treasurer of the State of Maine.

Similar contracts have been made with the Washington County Railroad company, now a part of the Maine Central system, and the Somerset Railroad company. These three companies are getting a rebate on their state taxes of about $56,000 per year, and this is about one-twelfth of the entire direct tax of the state. It is almost three times the annual appropriation for the state university, more than the entire state appropriations for high schools, fifty per cent more than the state expended on roads in 1905, and is more than the interest on the public debt of Maine.

It will be seen that the state of Maine is relieving these railroad companies of ninety-five per cent of their state taxes in consideration of the promise that the said railroads will transport over their lines "troops and munitions of war, in times of war, insurrection or civil commotion, free of charge other than as herein and in said act provided." Of course this grant is a mere subsidy to the railroads, but it is amusing to find the subsidy predicated upon a promise to carry troops in a war that is not only not in sight but which may never come. Many absurd reasons have been given for subsidies, and many excuses have been soberly set forth as a basis for appropriations, but it is doubtful whether the official records of any state present such a mirth-provoking contract. The railroads had to state some consideration in order to prevent a subsequent administration or legislature from repudiating the contract, and so this visionary consideration was solemnly inserted in the document.

The democrats of Maine have been having a good deal of fun with the republican party which is responsible for this agreement. They are suggesting that since the railroads are relieved of their taxes by a promise to carry troops in time of war, the plain citizens of Maine should be relieved from taxation on condition that they promise to enlist when this imaginary war breaks out. The rank and file of the republican party of Maine must be dull, indeed, if they cannot see the joke that has been perpetrated upon them, and they must be as indifferent as the people of Philadelphia to

the misconduct of their representatives if they do not rise in indignation and protest against such corporation domination.

The democratic editors who spend so much time in pointing out the dangers of government ownership and so little time in informing the public of the abuses that have grown up under private ownership might give a little editorial space to the contract above set forth.

In the meantime those who enjoy humor need not go to the expense of buying funny books and papers—they can find much that is humorous in the serious arguments advanced by republican leaders and in the actual transactions between the various governments and the powerful corporations. The difference between the graft that has been developed in the building of Pennsylvania's state house and the graft of these Maine railroads is small—it is only a question of time and degree.

THE VALUATION OF RAILROADS

Messrs. B. E. Sundberg, O. O. Canestorp, T. E. Cashman, S. A. Nelson, Ole O. Sageng, members of the senate committee of the state of Minnesota, with the aid of an able and conscientious attorney, Mr. James Manahan, have prepared a most interesting report on the value of the railroads doing business in Minnesota. They find that the capital stock and bonded debt of the Chicago, Great Western is $143,668 per mile while in actual value it is about $28,000 per mile. The Wisconsin, Minnesota & Pacific railway is stocked and bonded at $43,134 per mile while it can be reproduced in its present condition for $16,000 per mile.

The committee finds that the capitalization of the railroads in that state, including stock and bonds, is about $50,000 per mile taking all the railroads together, and that the actual value of the railroads is about $27,000 per mile. From this it appears that the railroads are expecting to collect interest and dividends on almost twice the value of the roads, measured by the cost of reproducing them. Is it not high time for an official

valuation of the railroads of the United States so that the people may know to what extent they are compelled to pay extensive and extortionate rates? Who can oppose a law for the ascertaining of the value of the railroads? No one unless he is more interested in the railroads than in the public in general. Their representative in the United States senate, in the house of representatives, and in the state legislatures should make it his business to urge both state and federal legislation which will obtain for the public information concerning the value of the railroads.

MUNICIPAL INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

The Commoner, having made note of the fact that the city of Lincoln, Neb., has adopted the initiative and referendum, is in receipt of several requests for an explanation of the system as it operates under the Nebraska statutes. The statute, enacted in 1905, reads in part as follows:

"The right to propose ordinances for the government of any city, or other municipal subdivision of the state of Nebraska, shall in addition to being exercised by the mayor and city council of such city, or the governing authorities of such other municipal subdivsion of this state, be vested in the voters thereof as hereinafter provided."

The statute then provides that when twenty per cent of the voters of the city or municipal subdivision petition for an ordinance, the same shall be submitted to the voters at a special election to be held not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days from the time of filing the petition. If in the meantime the council enacts the ordinance petitioned for with amendments of its own, both the ordinance petitioned for and the ordinance as enacted must be submitted to popular vote, each properly designated.

After an ordinance is enacted by the authorities

twenty per cent of the voters of the municipality may by petition compel its submission to the voters of the city for adoption or rejection.

The law provides how the petitions must be framed and also for the proper qualifications of those who may become signers. A specified number of petitioners must make affidavit that all signers are bona fide citizens and that their signatures as attached are genuine.

Whether or not a city will operate under the initiative and referendum is left to the decision of the voters.

A QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP

George Fred Williams tells a story that has an application to present day politics. According to the story there was a debate in a colored club over the question: Resolved, that when one hen lays an egg and another hen sets on the egg, the hen that laid the egg is the mother of the chicken. Both sides were ably presented, and the presiding officer was leaning strongly toward the side of the negative. Finally a colored brother in the rear of the room injected a question—"Suppose a case," said he, "suppose the egg is a duck egg, then who is the mother of the duck, the duck that laid the egg or the hen what set on the egg?" This argument caused consternation in the ranks of the speakers on the negative, but the presiding officer was equal to the occasion. He rapped for order, and after scratching his head answered: "Ducks am not before de house; chickens am de question; therefore I rules de ducks out."

President Roosevelt has been hatching out policies which the democratic party originated, and it becomes a very interesting question "Who am de mother of the chicken"—who shall have the credit of authorship? As there is no presiding officer to rule out the arguments presented in behalf of the affirmative, the democrats will insist that as they advocated these policies long before

the president took them up, they shall not be denied credit for them even though he has acted as an incubator and hatched these policies out.

WARS

The Sioux City Journal, always a welcome visitor to The Commoner's exchange desk, despite its many political shortcomings, says: "Mr. Bryan is the friend of international peace, but that is another matter. Mr. Bryan is a good man, but the flesh is weak when it comes to feeling sorry over the strife raging in the republican party. There is hardly any territory on the map of the United States claimed by the republican party that is free of war. The bloodshed in many states is up to high water mark."

Mr. Bryan has so trained himself as to be able to take a very philosophic view of the state of affairs outlined by the esteemed Journal. His dislike of war is, of course, modified somewhat by circumstances and the kind of warfare being waged. When Texas imported the Guatamalean bug to wage warfare on the boll weevil Mr. Bryan approved. When the chief agriculturist of Kansas turned the ladybugs loose to wage war upon the wheat-destroying greenbug, again Mr. Bryan applauded and wished that the war could be waged to a finish.

So, too, when viewing the internicine strife now waging in the republican ranks, Mr. Bryan, remembering the boll weevil and the greenbug, is quite willing that this warfare should continue until, like the famed cats of Kilkenney that fought and fought until instead of two cats there weren't any, there will be no more republican party, but an organization that has a higher conception of citizenship than the mere desire to use it to advance the selfish interests of the few at the expense of the many.

Despite his advocacy of peace, national and international, Mr. Bryan is not yet ready to declare against wars of every kind. He is trying to raise a little wheat, and he has some friends in the Texas cotton belt.

FAKE NEWS FROM LINCOLN

There seems to be an epidemic of fake news from the city of Lincoln, and it all comes from Mr. Bryan's "friends"—names not given. Several dispatches have been sent out lately purporting to state what Mr. Bryan thinks or what Mr. Bryan is going to do, and the information thus given out is usually collected from "Mr. Bryan's friends." One dispatch has "Mr. Bryan's friends" reporting that Mr. Bryan will not be a candidate in case President Roosevelt is nominated. This dispatch brought inquiries from different parts of the country. It would seem unnecessary to deny reports sent out to which no name was attached, and yet it has been necessary to send a number of telegrams to notify other papers that the report was unauthorized and that Mr. Bryan's real friends do not attempt to speak for him on important questions.

As Mr. Bryan has a paper—The Commoner—through which he speaks every week, and as he is speaking often and giving out interviews frequently, a newspaper ought to view with suspicion any report sent out from Lincoln or anywhere else purporting to state what Mr. Bryan thinks or intends to do.

Every reader of The Commoner knows that Mr. Bryan has endorsed the good things done by President Roosevelt and has done so with satisfaction, but he has also pointed out the undemocratic things that the president has said and done. Mr. Bryan has never said anything or done anything that indicated a desire to have Mr. Roosevelt elected for a third term. In fact, the third term idea has been discussed in The Commoner with the same frankness that characterizes the discussion of other questions. Mr. Bryan is opposed to a second term, having attempted while in congress to secure an amendment to the constitution making the president ineligible to a second term. During both of the campaigns in which he was a candidate he announced that he would not under any circumstances be a candidate for a second term. It is hardly to be expected that he would advocate the election of the president to a third term. When the president retires in March, 1909, he

will have served about seven years and a half, and that is so near two full terms that no possible juggling with words can convert it into one term.

The third term issue would of itself rule the president out, and while he has endorsed several democratic measures, he has not carried these as far the democrats would have carried them, and has endorsed only a portion of the democratic platform, and the popularity which the president has won by carrying a few democratic measures for a little way shows how popular a real democrat would be who carried out all democratic principles.

STRANGE ADVISORS

A Chanute, Kansas, reader of The Commoner writes: "I write you to request that you print in The Commoner a brief summary of President Roosevelt's cabinet appointments, commenting on each as to his former business affiliations and environment. My memory is not very good, but my recollection is that practically all his cabinet appointees, including the present cabinet, especially those who have directly to do with the enforcement of law against trusts, railroads, etc., are men who have been for years previous to their appointment engaged in and upon the pay roll of trusts, railroads, etc., and that the same is very largely true of his appointees for district attorneys and judges. If he is as sincere in his desires to compel trusts, railroads, etc., to treat the people fairly as he seems to be upon the surface, and as many people believe him to be, he should cease appointing that class of men to office. I have read in The Commoner from time to time, comments upon individual appointees along this line, but it occurs to me that if a column or two in The Commoner was devoted to the subject as a whole, it would serve a good purpose for the enlightenment of the people."

Mr. Roosevelt has not been particularly fortunate, so far as an anti-monopoly program is concerned, in the selection of his official advisors. It will be remembered that Senator Culberson of Texas objected to Mr. Bona-

parte's confirmation as attorney-general because of a speech delivered several years ago at Chicago, wherein he plainly showed that he had no prejudices against the trust system. Elihu Root, secretary of state, was for years one of the most successful of the great corporation lawyers, and is believed to stand very close to some of the representatives of special interests. Mr. Straus, the secretary of commerce and labor, is identified with New York business interests, having been connected with a mercantile firm there. In recent years most of his time has been spent in public office. Mr. Metcalf, secretary of the navy, was a California lawyer and a member of congress. He was not particularly noted for any strong anti-monopoly tendency. Mr. Meyer, the postmaster-general, has since 1900 held office in the diplomatic service. He is identified with the business interests of Boston, being a director in a large number of local corporations and banks. Mr. Garfield, the secretary of the interior, practiced law at Cleveland, Ohio. He it was who gave the beef trust the famous immunity bath. Mr. Taft, secretary of war, has held appointive office nearly all of his life. Until he entered the cabinet he owed his political preferment to the Foraker influence in Ohio. He has never been particularly demonstrative against the special interests. Mr. Cortelyou began his public life as a stenographer under the Cleveland administration and with the details of his rapid rise everyone is familiar.

Mr. Roosevelt certainly is not greatly aided in his fight against monopoly by the fact that there is not a member of his cabinet from whom, judged by his record and early environment, the president could expect cordial sympathy and enthusiastic aid in a real fight against monopoly.

TAFT MUST SPEAK

The Sioux Falls, S. D., Press, a republican paper of the Roosevelt brand, appears not to be satisfied with Mr. Roosevelt's O. K. on the Taft boom. The Press says: "In view of the fact that Mr. Taft is Mr. Roose-

velt's candidate for president in 1908, and in view of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt is making an effort to secure Taft's nomination, on the ground that he will carry out his (Roosevelt's) policies, it would be of great interest to the public to know what Mr. Taft's views are on those questions which have made Mr. Roosevelt popular. * * * On these questions Mr. Taft has been silent and there is a belief in some quarters that he is satisfactory to trusts and combinations, to railroads, and to the very rich, and that he really stands for nothing that the president is popularly supposed to stand for."

Why should there be any doubt concerning a public man's position upon the pressing questions of the day? When a man is urged for the presidency on the theory that he is an anti-monopolist, why should he hesitate to say something by way of reassuring the people whose support he seeks? It is evident that Mr. Taft will find it difficult in the year of 1908 to pose as the champion of anti-monopoly while leaving his followers in doubt as to his own views concerning questions pertaining to monopoly.

LICENSING INTERSTATE CORPORATIONS

A few democrats have expressed alarm lest the exercise of the powers vested in congress to control interstate commerce may result in injustice to corporations organized under state laws. The license system advocated by Mr. Bryan is just now being vigorously attacked by these gentlemen. It may not be out of place to remind these that the license plan was endorsed in the democratic national convention of 1900 and that no fight was made upon it in the convention and no opposition was manifested by democrats during the campaign. The plank reads as follows:

"We pledge the democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, state and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced, and more stringent ones must be enacted providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, requiring all

corporations to show, before doing business outside the state of their origin, that they have no water in their stock, and that they have not attempted, and are not attempting, to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any articles of merchandise, and the whole constitutional power of congress over interstate commerce, the mails and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts."

Can it be that any who call themselves democrats are not willing to go as far now on the trust question as the party went in 1900?

Not only was the license system endorsed in the national platform but it was advocated by Mr. Bryan before any of the conventions were held which selected delegates to the national convention. The fact that Mr. Bryan was endorsed for the nomination by nearly every state and territory after he had advocated the license system in all parts of the union ought to be evidence that this system is not considered undemocratic by those who are in the habit of voting the democratic ticket.

WATCH THE FRONTIER

The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune sends to his newspaper an interesting story to the effect that thousands of Japanese coolies are being smuggled into the United States over the frontiers of Canada and Mexico. The Tribune correspondent says: "At the time when the Japanese ambassador was protesting against the treatment of his fellow countrymen in San Francisco, and while the Japanese themselves at the Golden Gate were passing resolutions demanding protection from the authorities, other Japanese, in defiance of law and the proclamation of the president, were sneaking over the border by the scores, and by hundreds, and probably by thousands. It is a curious contradiction that after congress had passed an exclusion law intended to keep the Japanese out of the country, and after those already here had been made the victim

of race prejudice in San Francisco, the little brown men should resort to such extraordinary means to get into a country where they are not wanted and where at best their lot is anything but a happy one. The frontier is like a sieve, and the Japanese are streaming in at every hole, now under one pretext, and now under another. They are coming secretly from Mexico and from Canada, and openly with forged papers through Seattle and San Francisco. The Japanese government is not to blame, but it is none the less true that while the Japanese ambassador here is calling the attention of President Roosevelt and Secretary Root to the treatment of his countrymen in San Francisco, others equally his countrymen are sneaking into the country in defiance of its laws, and in spite of the unfriendly attitude of the people upon whom they seem determined to precipitate themselves."

It will occur to a great many people that the welfare of American citizens is entitled to some consideration. Many have believed that the administration has exceeded the limit in catering to the whims of Japanese politicians. Accepting the Tribune's story as true, a little activity along the Canadian and Mexico frontiers would be decidedly appropriate.

THE JAMESTOWN EXPOSITION

As will be seen by the speech reported in this issue, Mr. Bryan attended the Jamestown exposition on Patrick Henry day. Having had an opportunity to inspect the grounds, the buildings and the exhibits he urges the readers of The Commoner to visit the exposition. The place is not only historic but delightful. All the attractions of the seashore are to be found there and one can enjoy an outing while he refreshes his memory as to the early settlement of Virginia. At Williamsburg, an hour's ride from Norfolk, are the college which Jefferson attended, the church in which seven presidents wor-

shipped and the foundation of the house of Burgesses where the doctrine of "no taxation without representation" was promulgated.

At Hampton Roads one sees a number of modern battleships and recalls the epoch making engagements between the Monitor and the Merrimac. The representation of this battle on the grounds of the exposition is, by the way, one of the most interesting side features that any exposition has presented.

The exhibit of the national government is the best that has ever been made and is in itself a liberal education. The group representing the pioneers trading with the Indians is a superb thing.

The state exhibits are very complete and great taste is displayed in their arrangement.

The buildings are well planned and substantially built.

While the lateness of the spring has delayed some of the work there is more there now than most of the visitors have time to see and the government's work will be completed soon.

Go to the Jamestown exposition and take your children with you. They will find inspiration in the memory of the early days and instruction in the evidences of the nation's progress.

"NO TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION"

Mr. Bryan's speech on Patrick Henry Day at the Jamestown exposition (Norfolk, Va.) May 30, 1907:

Ladies and Gentlemen: It gives me great pleasure to return to Virginia at any time. And I have frequently given myself the gratification of coming among the people of the state in which my father was born. I know that there is no distinction quite equal to being a son of Virginia; but a grandson comes next to it. And it is with an added pleasure that I come today, when I am to participate in the commemoration of an event that so strongly influenced for good the history of this country and the destiny of the world.

I appreciate the very kind words that have been

spoken of me; the invitation that brought me here; the greeting that you accorded, and the introduction which I have received. I enjoyed the singing of the children —the singing of the northern Yankee Doodle, and then I enjoyed the singing of the southern one, Dixie, just after it. I am glad that our national music rests upon two songs; that we have a sort-of-a-double-standard-music, so to speak; and I am satisfied that, according to the sentiment of this audience, it is sixteen to one in favor of Dixie.

We like Dixie in the north. The anxiety of our people to get that war concluded was not entirely because it was a costly war in money and in men, but we wanted to get through with it so we could get "Dixie" and have it for a national air, and not have you monopolize it. You will find that Dixie brings forth shouts in the north as well as in the south.

This day brings us to a consideration of the pioneer; and the more I have thought of the pioneer, the greater has been my respect for him. The pioneer lays the foundation upon which subsequent generations build. I have been thinking of those pioneers who, three centuries ago landed here with an ocean behind them, an unsettled continent before them, and began to lay the foundation of an American civilization. I am reminded of the early instance of faith, where Abraham, at the call of the Almighty, went a thousand miles away from home and friends, and began the establishment of a race and the founding of a religion based upon the worship of one God. As the result of that man's faith there grew up a race that has not been surpassed in history; and as the result of that man's faith, nearly four hundred millions of human beings daily bow in worship of one God. A remarkable act of faith, and yet it was a faith that was akin to that which brought people across an ocean three thousand miles wide. In three centuries their work has increased until eighty millions of people rejoice in the most advanced civilization that history has known; and they can trace its beginning to the pioneers who settled here, at New York and at Plymouth Rock. Three hundred years—how long that seems! The city in which I live is only forty years old, and has

nearly fifty thousand inhabitants. Three hundred years —that seems long to us in Nebraska, for our country is new, and yet, measured by years, this Jamestown settlement is not an old settlement. Go to Kiota, Japan, and you will find a temple twelve hundred years old, and by the temple there hangs a great bell as old as the temple. Nine hundred years before your ancestors turned the prows of their vessels towards Jamestown, that bell was calling the followers of Buddha to worship. Four tri-centennials might have been celebrated in that temple.

Go to Benares, India, and you will find a pagoda. Two thousand five hundred years ago the foundation was laid. Eight tri-centennials have passed since then.

Go into Egypt and you will find a sphynx carved by one whose name has long since been forgotten. For something like forty centuries its sleepless eyes have looked out upon that verdant strip that forms the wondrous valley of the Nile. It was there before Columbus thought of the New Land; it was there before Cicero thundered against Cataline; it was there before Joseph was carried down into Egypt. Tri-centennials have passed since that silent sentinel began to guard the land of the Pharaohs. Measured by years, I repeat, this is not an old settlement; but measured by achievements, it has no equal in recorded history.

From this triple settlement along the shores of the Atlantic, the pioneers have gone out until they have given to the world a marvelous industrial development; made this the intellectual leader of the world; established here a moral center, from which good influences go out to every other nation; and converted this young nation into a political Mecca to which the reformers of every land come to renew their inspiration.

I might, with profit to you and myself, dwell upon these phases of our nation's great development. I might speak of the wonderful industry of my countrymen; I might tell you how they have opened mines; how they have bridged rivers; how they have converted deserts into fertile farms. I might tell you how they have bound all parts of this country together with bands of steel and with copper wire; I might tell you of a people who

produce and consume every year something like three times the amount produced and consumed by any equal population in the world or in history. I might tell you of the schools that bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education, a school system commencing with the kindergarten and ending with the great university. I might tell you of this nation's growth in altruism and of the speed of our ideas of government. There is not a land in the world that has not been illumined by the light that was kindled here three centuries ago.

But the proprieties of this occasion require that I confine myself to matters of government. It is fitting that Virginia should celebrate this day, for in matters of government Virginia has played a supreme part. During revolutionary days the Old Dominion furnished not only the first, but the greatest of our executives. During the revolutionary days Virginia furnished the greatest of all statesmen—not of that period alone, but of all time, for no other statesman, before or since, stands in the class with Thomas Jefferson. But, not satisfied with presenting the greatest executive and statesman, Virginia presented an orator worthy to be classed with Demosthenes, who has for more than twenty centuries been the world's model in public speaking. As an impassioned orator, even Demosthenes was not superior to Patrick Henry.

Sometimes I receive a letter from a student who tells me that he is a born orator, and wants to know what such an one should do to prepare himself for his life work. I generally reply that orators must be born like other people, but that birth is the smallest part of an orator's equipment. Men are not born orators. If I want to calculate the future of a young man in public speaking, I do not ask him whether his mother spoke well, or his father spoke a great deal; I do not think it makes much difference. An orator is a product of his time, and there are and always will be orators when there are great interests at stake, and when men arise with a message to deliver. There are two essentials in oratory; first that the man shall know what he is talking about, and second, that he shall mean what he

says. You cannot have eloquence without these two essentials. If a man does not know a thing he cannot tell it—if he is not informed himself he cannot inform others, and if he does not feel in his own heart he cannot make anybody else feel. And next to these two, I would place clearness of statement. There are not only certain self-evident truths, but all truth is self-evident, and the best service one can render truth is to present it so clearly that it can be understood, for if the truth is clearly stated you do not need to defend it, it defends itself. I do not mean to say that any truth can be so clearly stated that no one will dispute it. I think it was Lord Macaulay who said that if any money was to be made by it, learned men would be found to dispute the laws of gravitation. But what I mean to say is this, that a truth can be so clearly stated that no one will dispute it unless he has some reason for disputing it, sometimes a pecuniary reason, sometimes a reason founded upon prejudice, or some other selfish interest, and when you find a man disputing a self-evident truth there is no use arguing with him; it is a waste of time. Argue with some one who is open to conviction. For instance, if you say to a man, "It is wrong to steal," a self-evident truth, and he says, "I do not know about that," it is no use to argue with him—search him, and you will probably find the reason in his pocket.

Next to clearness of statement, I would put conciseness of statement—the saying much in a few words. Patrick Henry had all of these qualities. He knew what he was talking about, he understood the fundamental principles of the science of government; he understood human rights, and he understood the human heart. He not only knew what he was talking about, but he meant what he said—he spoke from his heart to the hearts of those who listened. They were learned and influential men in those days who opposed him, but when he made his impassioned appeal to the sense of justice he was greater than all of them. He had the power of stating a question clearly. He could strip away the verbiage that is sometimes used to conceal ideas, he could present the idea clearly and he could present a thought in a few words. No great thought has ever been more

strongly presented, more clearly presented, more concisely presented than that great thought which he presented when he exclaimed: "Give me liberty or give me death!" He might have spoken for hours, but he could not have added to the strength of the statement by the use of further words. He was a great orator, and his influence rested upon his ability to speak to the hearts of the people. He did not speak for himself, no orator can speak for himself and be eloquent. He must have a larger cause. If a man is to be eloquent he must speak for mankind; only then can he appeal to the hearts of men. A man is of little importance in this world, except as he can advance a principle, or help his fellows. Patrick Henry seized a great principle and brought it into prominence. He spoke not for himself, but for all the people of this country—he was the voice of the people, he was the conscience of the masses, and therefore when he spoke for them he carried conviction. He presented in a few words the greatest theme that we have to deal with in matters of government. I will read you four propositions which he set forth in a few words—four propositions which mean more in matters of government than any other four propositions that I know of, except the four stated in the Declaration of Independence. Let me read you these propositions:

First, "Every attempt to rest such power (the power to levy taxes) in any other person or persons whatsoever, other than the general assembly aforesaid, has a manifest tendency to destroy British as well as American freedom."

What is the principle embodied in that statement? It is that liberty is universal in its application, and that you cannot strike it down in one part of the world without striking it a blow in every other part of the world. There was an American, a young man reared in the new country, not acquainted with the classics; there he was warning the people of England that if they dared to strike down liberty in our country they would strike it down in their own country at the same time. He was wiser than the statesmen of England, because he understood human rights and he understood human hearts. He knew that when one denied liberty to others he at-

tacked the foundation upon which his own liberty stood. It was an important lesson, and England learned it, and she has not attempted to govern other colonies of her own race as she had attempted to govern our colonies. She learned something from Virginia's great orator, and she has not forgotten the lesson up to this time. Canada today is more free because of the words Patrick Henry spoke. Australia is more free because of the fight that Patrick Henry led. New Zealand has more liberty because of the wisdom that Patrick Henry taught.

Another thought that he expresses. Let me read this resolution:

"Resolved, That the taxation of the people by themselves or by persons chosen by themselves to represent them, who can only know what taxes the people are able to bear and the easiest mode of raising them, and are equally affected by such taxes themselves is the distinguishing characteristic of British freedom, and without which the ancient constitution cannot exist."

Now I want to refer to the last portion first. "And are equally affected by such taxes themselves." My friends, Patrick Henry has put into few words an indictment against every colonial system that this world has known. The curse of the colonial system is that the people who make the laws for the colonies do not have to live under the laws, and therefore the colonies are sacrificed to the mother country. It has always been true. It was true when we were colonies. England tried to sacrifice our industries to her industries and our people to her people. Go down into Mexico and you will find that the war with Spain grew out of the fact that Spain was sacrificing Mexico to Spain. Go into Cuba, and you will find that the thing that stirred the people to revolution was that Spain was sacrificing Cuba to Spain. Today the thing that stirs the heart of the native of India is that England is sacrificing the people of India to England. It has always been true that the mother country sacrifices the colonies to the mother country, and we are not entirely free from it ourselves, for we have sacrificed the industries of the Philippines to the industries of the United States. We

have deprived them of their markets, we have made them subjects of this country, and we have compelled them to depend upon our laws, and then we have refused to treat them justly because great interests in our own country demanded first consideration. In that phrase Patrick Henry put his finger upon the evil that runs through every colonial policy. The people who make the laws do not live under them.

I have sometimes in the north had occasion to remind our republican brethren that they were very inconsistent when they objected to the suffrage qualifications in the south and yet would not allow the Filipinos to be citizens at all, and I have emphasized this very point. The black man when he cannot vote has this protection, that he lives under the law that the white man makes for himself, and that that is a protection, but we make the Filipino live under a law that we make for him, and that we would not live under ourselves.

But the two thoughts that I desire to emphasize today are expressed in this resolution—taxation and representation. Taxation is the most permanent question that we have to deal with. Other questions may come and other questions may go, but taxation, like Tennyson's "Brook," goes on and on forever. We may dispute about the amount, we may discuss the method, but there will always be taxation. The power to tax is the power to destroy, and those who can exercise the taxing power can exercise it to the destruction of those whom they tax. Now, we have two kinds of taxation, direct taxation and indirect taxation. Direct taxation is better than indirect taxation—why? Because a thing that you can watch is not as dangerous as a thing which you cannot watch. The best definition of indirect taxation I have ever read was given by a Frenchman. He said that its chief merit was that by means of it you could get the most feathers off a goose with the least squawking, and I have sometimes thought that man had to have some of the qualities of the goose to be fond of indirect taxation. Indirect taxation is most liable to abuse because excesses are not so easily observed and, therefore, not so quickly corrected.

People bear much heavier burdens when they are

collected indirectly than they would be willing to bear if they were collected directly. Now most of our taxes, nearly all for the support of the federal government, are collected on consumption and taxes on consumption are the most inequitable that there are, because a tax upon consumption taxes people according to what they need and not according to what they have. Our needs are more uniform than our possessions, for God was the creator of our needs and He was quite democratic in His method of distributing them. We all need about the same amount of food and we need about the same amount of clothing. It takes the same amount of fire to protect us from the cold, we need the same shelter. When you tax people according to consumption you make the poor man pay more than his share and the rich man less than his share.

There are two forms of taxation that are more equitable than taxes on consumption. One is taxation in proportion to the property. If one man has a home worth one thousand dollars, and another man has a business block worth half a million, why should they not pay in proportion to the property they own? It is property that needs the protection of the government. Go into your courts, talk to your policemen, and you will find that it is property, not human life, that most needs protection. Human life needs protection far less than property—then why not tax property, if property is the chief object of the government's care.

But there is a better form of taxation even than property taxation, it is income taxation—which makes people pay according to the income they enjoy. If a man has a farm and you tax him according to the value of his land he has to pay it, even if he has no crop that year to pay it with, but if you tax his income, and he has a large tax to pay it is because he has a large income with which to pay it, and if his income decreases his tax also decreases.

But, my friends, there is such a thing as farming out taxes, and I want to speak for a moment on that. Taxes are farmed out now in three ways. First, when we allow manufacturers to make tariff laws and decide how much they will take from the rest of the people; second,

when we allow municipal corporations to determine how much they will charge without any power to regulate them; third, when we allow railroads to determine how much they shall charge, and fourth, when we allow industrial monopolies to hold people by the throat and take from their pockets whatever the managers of the monopolies desire. Now, when I say that our protective tariff is a system by which taxes are farmed out, I am aware that I may find some critics, but when our high tariff laws are made they are made by the men who want taxation, not by the man who pays the taxes.

When I asked for a place on the ways and means committee, or rather, asked an eastern democrat to recommend me, he said, "There is no chance." I had a letter of introduction to him from a friend of his; he was pleased to receive the letter, and told me he would be glad to do anything he could for me, and so I told him I wanted a place on that committee. He said "that is impossible." I asked why. He said, "We put men from the manufacturing states on that committee." I said, "What about the consumers?" He said, "We don't put them on that committee." When the protectionists are in power, they make up the committee from the men who represent the tax eater and not the tax payer; and these men make the laws in their own interests, and the manufacturers collect from the people not only as much as goes into the treasury, but sometimes ten times as much as goes into the treasury. Why, if a man proposed to your city council that he be allowed to collect a certain amount for your city, and that he would charge ten times as much for collecting that amount as the amount he turned in, would you think of employing him? And yet we have instances when the amount paid by the people on account of the tariff is ten times the amount turned into the treasury. This is not only farming out the taxes, but it is paying a large commission for the collection of the taxes.

And so we are farming out the taxes when we charter a corporation which is not regulated by competition. There are only two ways of regulating corporations, one is by law and the other is by competition, and when competition is not possible, the people are taxed with-

out representation and without mercy unless there is efficient regulation.

All over this land we have seen this struggle between the people and the corporations, and we see it in this country today on the railroad question. In 1896 the democratic platform declared for railroad regulation, in 1900 it did so, and again in 1904. After ten years of effort on our part, a republican president took the lead on the subject, and he had the fight of his life to get his bill through the senate. Ten years of effort to get regulation, and when the time came it took the president and all his influence, and the influence of all the democrats, to get the bill through the senate, and at last the president, in order to make it a republican measure, compromised with the representatives of the railroads in the United States senate. If I am to talk on taxation, I must be allowed to refer to the taxation this country is bearing today, because we do not regulate the corporations as we ought to regulate them. Some constantly talk against the government ownership of railroads, but say nothing against railroad extortion and discrimination. Well we have not reached that question, but we have reached the question of our railroad regulation, and I have sometimes felt tempted to suggest that the man who spends his time talking about the dangers of government ownership could better serve the public by protecting the masses from the greed of the corporations of today.

Seventeen years ago this fall I went down to the southeast corner of my state to make a political speech. After speaking in the afternoon at the county seat, I went out several miles into the country to speak at a schoolhouse. I don't remember what I said that night, but I remember what a farmer said who also made a speech. He said he rented his land from the railroad. He added that the company let him hold the title and pay the taxes, but that he was really a tenant, for he got what was left after the company took what it wanted; and today our railroads are doing much the same, and the people who patronize them are simply getting for their crops what is left after the railroads take what

they want. The only regulation we have thus far does not go to the root of the matter.

What is the effect of our new rate law, which was so hard to get? There are two effects so far. One is, it stopped rebates; that is good, but what was the pecuniary effect? Why, the railroads keep the money they formerly paid to the favored shippers—that is, the railroads get more money. What was the other effect? It stopped passes, and that gave to the railroads the money that those used to save who rode on passes. So far, we have increased the revenues of the road and that is all that the law has thus far done. Rebates were bad and it was necessary to stop them, but stopping rebates helps the railroads. When the various states said: "Well, now, we have given you this advantage by stopping rebates and passes, we will reduce passenger and freight rates, and make you share the advantage with the people." In some of the states the railroads are so ungrateful for what has been given them that they go into the courts to try to keep people from having the benefit of the two-cent rate. The railroads now want to have all regulating power taken from the states and lodged in the federal government. The states are nearer to the people and the representatives more responsive to the will of the people, and I am not willing that we shall surrender any of the authority that the states now have over the railroads.

But the effort of the railroad managers to get away from the states ought to be a warning to the people to keep in the state all the power that the state now has. No wonder that the railroads are willing to risk congress. They have risked congress for a good many years; and I am reminded of a joke that John Allen perpetrated. He came into the house one day after General Wheeler had voted and asked: "How did General Wheeler vote?" Someone told him that General Wheeler voted "aye." He said: "I will vote aye, for I followed General Wheeler through four years of war, and he never led me into any danger." General Wheeler had to get up and explain that John was never under his command; but it was a good joke and it served its purpose. I am not surprised that the railroads are

willing to have the power transferred to Washington, for they have had the United States senate for twenty years, and it has protected them in their extortion.

When you permit a monopoly to charge whatever it wishes for the necessaries of life you turn over the taxing power to them and in the case of the monopoly you do not even get a commission. The steel trust, for instance, is collecting a tribute from the people of this country. Every time you ship a pound of freight you pay tribute to the steel trust, for you pay your freight to the railroad, and the railroad has to increase its charges because of the steel trust, and within a week we have had the figures given to us to show that the steel trust, in order to increase its earnings, has made inferior rails. When a man rides on the railroad today he is not only contributing by freights to the large dividends of the steel trust, but his life is less secure because of the greed of the steel trust.

I have felt it was worth while to speak of present day taxation without representation, for it is not sufficient that we shall assemble here and praise the man who led the fight against the kind of injustice from which his people suffered, and shut our eyes to the injustice from which our people suffer today. I hope that in Virginia a new crop of Patrick Henrys will arise, who, speaking for the people, and reflecting the conscience of the people, will insist that a foreign despot having been driven from our land no domestic despot shall be allowed to take the throne.

But, my friends, there is another phase of this subject. Patrick Henry opposed taxation without representation that the people might have justice, and he presented in a sentence one of the reasons for representative government; and this doctrine has spread around the world. There is not a civilized land where this idea has not been planted and is not growing. Representative government! Why? That the people may rule, and this suggests the two schools of thought on the subject of representative government. Wherever they have had representative government they have had two theories; one theory is that the representative is elected to think for the people; the other theory is that

the people think for themselves and elect representatives to act for the people. I do not know what your theory is, but my theory—and I believe the democratic theory—is that the people do their own thinking, and elect servants to do what the people want done.

We are always talking about leaders, and yet there are two theories in regard to a leader; one is that the leader is to think for the people, and the other is that he is to think with the people. My idea is that he thinks with the people, not for the people. I would not think it an honor to be the leader of people who did not think; but it is an honor to be a co-laborer with people who do think. Some one has said that a leader is a man who is going in the same direction with the people, but a little bit ahead. I know of no better definition of a leader. If a man is going to be a leader he must have followers, and people will not follow him unless he is going in the same direction they are. Occasionally men have thought themselves leaders, and they looked around, and found the procession going off on another street. This is not unusual, and there is no more pathetic sight in this country than a leader without any followers, and yet we have had them. And when it does occur it occurs because the leader deserts his people.

The representative, therefore, is a man who represents, and to emphasize this point, I will add that if after a man is elected to represent the people, a question arises where he knows their position to be different from his, he ought to resign, and let them elect somebody to carry out their wishes. He may go back before them as a candidate and, telling them his views, ask them whether they want him to carry out those ideas, but no man who believes in the right of the people to govern themselves, will embezzle public power and use it as a personal asset. I care not whether in embezzling it he uses it to fill his own purse or to give expression to his egotism; a man who thinks he knows so much more than the people who elected him that he ignores their wishes, ought to be kept at home.

Principles do not change, but conditions sometimes require new applications. For instance, suppose the law reads: "Thou shalt not kill a man with a stick

or a stone." Then suppose a gun is invented. The old law will not do, so you move to amend by adding the words "or gun." You would take an old principle and bring it down to date. We know that the state legislatures elected the senators for about one hundred years without protest, but it kept getting worse and worse; finally an amendment was proposed providing for the election of senators by the people and, Brother Tucker, you were on that committee, if I am not mistaken, and you fought for it—and we carried it through the Fifty-second congress. It was carried through the Fifty-third congress, and then a misfortune befell the country—we had a republican congress, which did not give the subject consideration; and then another republican congress, and it did not, but the sentiment continued to grow, and the third republican congress acted favorably and then another and then another. Five times the popular branch of congress has, by more than a two-thirds vote, proposed an amendment that will make this change, and nearly two-thirds of the states of the union have declared for it. I am in favor of it. It has been in the democratic national platform twice, and it will be in the next democratic platform. I believe in it. Why?—because I believe a senator should be the representative of the people, and that the people, and not the corporations, should decide who shall occupy the seats in this highest legislative body in the world.

Now, so far, I know I am not going to encounter any opposition for I know that the man who opposes the popular election of senators will not have time to attack me; he will be busy defending himself.

But there is another proposition, and I am going to venture to mention it. You may not agree with me, but one advantage about living in this country is that even when people do not agree with you, they let you live. Some people have expressed regret that I have been defeated, or that I have not seen all the reforms carried out, but it is much better than it used to be; they used to hang reformers; now they simply defeat them. My Virginia father taught me something that has been worth more to me than if he had left me all the wealth Mr. Rockefeller will leave his children. He

taught me that I could afford to be in the minority, but that I could not afford to be in the wrong on any subject. Do you believe that the representative ought to represent? Do you believe that representatives should follow the wishes of their constituents? I think you do. If you do you are willing to go a step further, and give the people a method by which they can control their representatives.

I am willing to go that far. I referred in New York to the initiative and referendum, and some of the editors acted as if they had never heard of it. It was in the democratic national platform in 1900, that is, the principle of direct legislation was endorsed. The people have the right to control their legislative body, and the initiative and the referendum provide the means. By the initiative the people can compel the submission of any question upon which they wish to act, and by the referendum they can sit in judgment upon the acts of their legislators. Is that a strange doctrine? I do not know what your constitutional provisions are. My Brother Tucker says that the governor has the veto power—that means that after the legislature passes a bill the governor can veto it. Now if one man can veto the act of the legislature, why cannot all the people veto it? Is it not a queer doctrine that one man is wiser than all the people? If we are going to protect ourselves against taxation without representation we must have representatives who represent, and the right of the people to have their voice heard is more sacred than the right of any legislator to vote as he pleases, if he pleases to oppose the wishes of those who elect him.

But I have already occupied more time than I am entitled to. I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you; I appreciate the opportunity to participate in honoring America's greatest orator. I am glad to participate in the celebration of this day, when we invoke the name of a patriot whose heart was linked to the hearts of his people, and whose courage reflected the courage of his nation. I am glad to take part in an occasion when you emphasize the doctrine that taxation without representation is tyranny. I am glad to utilize this occasion to discuss the subject of taxation, for the whole

purpose of representative government is to secure justice. I learned in the schools that there were three kinds of government; the monarchy, the aristocracy and the democracy. The monarchy was supposed to be the strongest, the aristocracy the wisest, and the democracy the most just. If these definitions were correct, I would prefer the democracy, because justice is, after all, the only foundation upon which permanent government can rest. But I deny that monarchy is the strongest and that an aristocracy is the wisest. A government that can draw from the wisdom of all the people is wiser than a government that rests upon the wisdom of a part, for all the people know more than any of the people. Neither is a monarchy the strongest. It is said to act more quickly, but quickness is not the only characteristic of strength. I believe with Bancroft that a republic is, in truth, the strongest of all the governments because it builds its citadel in the hearts of men. I insist, therefore, our form of government is not only the most just, but the wisest and strongest, and I want it to be made stronger still by being made more just, if possible, than it is today. Because I opposed imperialism some used to call me a little American, but I will allow no one to go beyond me in estimating this nation's greatness. No one goes beyond me in his conception of the nation's mission. Do you want this nation to dominate the inferior races? I want it to influence the great races as well. Do you want it to conquer half-civilized nations? I want it to be the leader of the civilized nations. You cannot go beyond me in your conception of this nation's future. I want this nation to shake every throne on earth! Not by force or vioence, but by showing the world something better than thrones, a government resting upon the consent of the governed, strong because it is loved, and loved because it is good.

THE IRISH BILL

The London newspapers are not enthusiastic concerning the Irish bill. The Daily News regards it as a "small affair." The Morning Leader says it is not

free from "disadvantages." The Chronicle says that while it makes a serious attempt to "reduce Irish chaos to order and to extend the scope of local self-government," it is not nearly so comprehensive as was Mr. Chamberlain's scheme in 1895. The Standard says that neither Ireland or England is pleased. The Telegraph says the measure is mere jugglery rather than statecraft and the Daily Mail plainly shows its dissatisfaction all along the line.

The great meeting held at Dublin for the purpose of protesting against the bill indicates the temper of the Irish people and as the measure concerns the Irish people they are, after all, the ones to judge whether it meets the requirements of the situation.

"TRUSTING" THE PEOPLE

In a critical analysis of Oklahoma's proposed constitution the "American Lawyer" complains because that constitution places too much power with the people and says: "It cannot be said that the legislators of Oklahoma are unwilling to trust their constituents."

Why shouldn't they be willing to trust their constituents? The "American Lawyer" would seem to have it that the legislator is the haughty master instead of the mere servant. It forgets that, according to the American doctrine, government for the people is of and by the people.

THE OKLAHOMA CONSTITUTION

The Commoner has already called attention to the Oklahoma constitution and has ventured to suggest that it is the best constitution that there is in the United States today. Its superiority consists in the fact that its framers took advantage of the experience of other states. The New York Tribune referred to the delegates to Oklahoma's constitutional convention as cornfield lawyers, but it is interesting to note how carefully

these cornfield lawyers have been looking into other constitutions. Oklahoma's constitution was written from the standpoint of the people. It brings the government close to the people and keeps the government in the hands of the people. The republicans will have difficulty in convincing the people of Oklahoma that they cannot be trusted with the management of their own affairs.

A few references to the provisions of the Oklahoma constitution will show how carefully it has been written:

Section 4 of the bill of rights provides that no civil or military power shall interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage by those entitled to it.

Section 10 of the bill of rights provides that the writ of habeas corpus shall never be suspended.

Section 19 protects the right of trial by jury but permits a reduction of the jury to six men in county courts and in courts not of record. In civil cases and in criminal cases less than felonies, three-fourths of the whole number of the jurors concurring, shall have power to render a verdict. The provision for the three-fourths verdict in civil cases is important and is a step in advance.

Section 28 provides that the records, books and files of all corporations shall be at all times liable and subject to the full visitorial and inquisitoral powers of the state.

Section 31 provides that the right of the state to engage in any occupation or business for public purpose shall not be denied or prohibited, except that it shall not engage in the business of agriculture except for educational, scientific, penal or charitable purposes.

The advantages of the initiative and referendum are secured to the people so that they can control their representatives and make such changes as they shall deem best in their constitution and laws.

A department of labor is created, and the legislature is empowered to create a board of arbitration and conciliation.

In jury trials the verdict shall be general and while the court may, in its discretion, direct special findings, the judge shall not be required by law to direct the jury to make special findings.

The railroads are declared to be public highways and are subjected to strict control, and a corporation commission exercises supervision over quasi corporations created by the state.

The law is strict in regard to the creation of private corporations. No watered stock is allowed, campaign contributions are prohibited, and corporations are not allowed to own or control stock in competitive corporations. The license granted to mining or public service corporations shall contain a stipulation that such corporation will submit any difference it may have with employes with reference to labor to arbitration as provided by law. Corporations must file with the corporation commission a list of their stockholders, officers, directors, etc. No foreign corporation is permitted to carry on any business which is unlawful for a domestic corporation. Foreign corporations are not permitted, without the consent of the other party, to remove a case to the federal court, and no corporation is permitted to sell in one community at a lower price than it sells in another community, due allowance being made for transportation.

The legislature is given full power in regard to the levying and collecting of taxes of all kinds including graduated income taxes, inheritance taxes, succession taxes, etc.

Municipal franchises are limited to twenty-five years, and no municipal franchise can be granted, extended or renewed without a majority vote of the people.

No alien or person not a citizen of the United States except bona fide residents of Oklahoma shall acquire title to or own land in that state, and no corporation shall be licensed for the purpose of buying, acquiring or trading any farm property.

Children under fifteen shall not be employed in any occupation injurious to health or morals or especially hazardous. Boys under sixteen and women and girls shall not be employed underground in the operation of mines. Except in cases of emergency eight hours shall constitute a day's work underground in all of the mines of the state. All limit as to amount that may be recovered in cases of personal injury is removed. Con-

tributory negligence is made a matter of fact for the jury to decide, and no contract is valid which waives the benefits of the constitution.

The constitution can be amended by the submission of an amendment to the legislature or by the proposal of an amendment under the initiative and referendum.

The above are a few of the provisions of the constitution. It is a very long document and contains much of detail, but the spirit of the constitution is admirable, and unusual care has been taken in the framing of its provisions. There can be little doubt of its adoption by the people, and the voters will be lacking in appreciation of the great service rendered them by the delegates to the constitutional convention if they do not give to the democratic party an opportunity to put the constitution into operation under the most favorable circumstances. The democrats won a signal victory last fall in spite of the unfair districting of the two territories, and they have rewarded the confidence of the people by preparing a constitution of unusual merit. Oklahoma enters statehood with bright prospects, and she is fortunate in having her organic law prepared and submitted by men who believe in popular government and who are not afraid to trust the people.

"BEFORE RICHMOND"

The recent confederate reunion held at Richmond finds its climax in the unveiling of a magnificent monument to Jefferson Davis, the first president of the Confederacy. There was a large assembly of the veterans drawn to Richmond in part by its intimate connection with the Civil war—more than a thousand battles having been fought within the limits of Virginia—and partly by the fact that statues were to be unveiled to General Stewart and Mr. Davis. The unveiling of the Davis monument was preceded by a parade in which the governor of the state, the prominent confederate

officers and survivors of the war participated. Speeches were delivered by Governor Swanson of Virginia, Ex-Governor Evans of Georgia, Senator Carmack of Tennessee, and representatives of the Daughters of the Confederacy and representatives of other bodies which had participated in the building of the monument. The speeches breathed loyalty to fallen comrades, to the ideas for which they fought and to the union, of which all sections are now a part.

It is an interesting evidence of the passing of the prejudices of war that there is now recognition throughout the union of the conscientiousness, of fidelity to conviction, that characterizes the soldiers that fought on both sides. During the war and just afterwards it was difficult for either side to recognize the principles that actuated the other side. There was a lack of charity both north and south in dealing with the subjects connected with the war. Now that they are able to view the subject from a distance, the people recognize that the generation of forty years ago settled a question left as a legacy from earlier days and removed the one root of bitterness which defied a peaceful settlement.

The union is stronger, not weaker, for the passage at arms. The sacrifices endured by men and women on both sides are a sad but sacred heritage, and the devotion of the people of the south is not to be questioned because they defend the purity of their motives and quote authority in support of the position which they took on the subject of secession. The nation has no more loyal defenders than are to be found in the south, as the Spanish war showed, and the monuments reared to the confederate dead, while proving the warmth of southern affection and the lasting loyalty of southern love, are no menace to the nation's peace and prosperity. The greatest element in the victory of the north is that it has converted opponents into friends, and each side can find a pride in rejoicing in the worthiness of the foe which it met upon the battlefield.

JOHN T. MORGAN

The death of Senator John T. Morgan, of Alabama, removes from public life one of the most illustrious statesmen of our time. As a conscientious student of public affairs, as a faithful exponent of the interests of the people as he understood those interests, he had no superior, and few compared with him in extent of information or in facility of expression. He was an incorruptible man though he served with some senators who were but the hired servants of predatory wealth. His standing was such that no one dared to approach him with a mercenary argument. He has taken part in the discussion of every important question which has come before the senate since he entered public life, and his name is more closely connected with the Nicaragua canal project than with anything else. For many years he worked indefatigably to secure a canal across the isthmus by the Nicaragua route, and while at the last moment the Panama route was selected, it is safe to say that but for his indefatigable work, we would not have made the progress that we have toward connecting the two oceans.

His voice will no longer be heard in the counsels of the nation, but he has stamped his influence upon his generation, and the influence of his life have been potent for good. Peace to his ashes.

THAT TARIFF COMMISSION

Every once in a while we hear that a tariff commission is going to be appointed. Let no one be deceived. A tariff commission is only a part of the effort to prevent a revision of the tariff. Whenever the people get ready to act, they are sagely informed that the subject is so intricate that it must be submitted to a commission of experts. The first advantage of this policy is that it secures delay. Instead of having tariff reform at once, we have the promise that it may be reformed after awhile. The commission is usually made up of per-

sons who are friends of the tariff and who object to revision. They take evidence, and the taking of evidence occupies time. This enables the protected interest to continue the collection of taxes for an indefinite period. Of course the commission must take time for deliberation after the evidence is all in, and then it must take more time for the preparation of its report, and if the report can be delayed until congress adjourns, further time must lapse before the matter can be taken up in congress. Then the recommendation of the commission can be used as an argument against any further reduction than the commission recommends, and the representatives of protected industry can ignore any recommendations made. It does not help either to have the commission made up of both sides of the question, for the majority will be on the side of the high tariff, and it is likely to prolong the investigation to have both sides taking testimony. When the question finally comes before congress, each representative and senator will act upon his own judgment—or by the mouthpiece of the manufacturers of his district without regard to the recommendations of the commission—and a tariff commission means a delay of from two to four years in the consideration of the question without any advantage whatever in the final settlement, and all this time the manufacturers have the benefit of the schedules against which the people complain. No wonder the tariff commission idea is brought forward every time the people threaten an attack on the tariff wall.

WHAT ABOUT MISSOURI?

The Wall Street Journal says: "In answer to all the to-do about the serving of a subpoena upon John D. Rockefeller, it is refreshing to have the laconic answer which he sent to Judge Landis: 'I will be there.' The man whose word can be counted upon to be at the time and place required does not need to be placed under bond to fulfill his pledge. There is a good deal of stage play about the difficulty of finding Mr. Rockefeller,

whenever appearance at court is desired, but somehow or other he does not fail to present himself when he is really wanted. At the same time, he naturally dislikes the idea of being put on the stage for unnecessary gratification of popular curiosity."

Then what about that alleged effort on the part of Attorney-General Hadley of Missouri to secure Mr. Rockefeller's testimony? Does the Journal mean to intimate that Mr. Rockefeller was not "really wanted" by Mr. Hadley?

As a matter of fact is it not plain that Mr. Rockefeller sought to evade the writ issued from Judge Landis' court and intended to hide out as he did in the Missouri case? It is not difficult to believe that Mr. Rockefeller surrendered simply because his advisors learned that Judge Landis would not relent and that the game of hide-and-seek in this instance would attract such widespread attention and stir up such a bitter sentiment that criminal prosecution—the one thing feared by the arrogant monopolist—would be demanded by the people.

THREATENING PANIC

Whenever the people show any disposition to stop the extortion practiced by the trusts the trust magnates threaten to bring a panic if they are disturbed. They learned it from the tariff barons who have for a generation warded off tariff reform by the threat of panic.

Now come the manipulators of our great railroad systems and threaten panic if they are interfered with. The trust magnates, the tariff barons and the railroad magnates have their hands in the pockets of the people and they demand that they shall be permitted to continue their exploitation of the public as the price at which they will allow the people to enjoy prosperity.

Have we reached the point where all legislation must await the consent of the beneficiaries of privilege and favoritism? Is this the condition to which the repub-

licans have brought the country? The sooner reform comes the easier it will be accomplished—the longer it is delayed the more radical the change.

GOODBYE TO THE CHRONICLE

Democrats everywhere will be interested in an Associated Press dispatch, dated Chicago, May 31. The dispatch follows: "The Chicago Chronicle this morning announces that it will cease publication with this issue owing to the fact that the paper has been unprofitable for some time. The following notice signed by the editor, H. W. Seymour, follows: 'As it has not been profitable of late, publication of the Chronicle with be suspended with this issue. All liabilities of the Chicago Chronicle company will be met in the regular course.' The Chronicle began publication on May 28, 1895, as the only democratic morning paper then in Chicago. John R. Walsh, one of the chief owners and formerly president of the Chicago National Bank, refused the support of his paper to William J. Bryan during Bryan's candidacy for the presidency, and during the last national campaign the Chronicle came out as a republican newspaper. The last issue of the Chronicle was No. 4 of volume 13."

The Chronicle was an ably edited and handsomely printed newspaper, but it utterly failed as a democratic organ, because it used its great abilities in an effort to persuade its party to be undemocratic.

It was a good thing for the democratic party when the Chronicle deserted it and went over to the republicans. Neither the republican party nor the general public suffered when the Chronicle went out of business altogether, because it stood for special privilege and employed its great abilities to the detriment of the public interests in every serious contest between privilege and the general welfare.

BY THE MASSES, OF COURSE

In a recent issue The Commoner printed this editorial:

"Those who urge the nomination of a 'conservative' candidate by the democratic convention studiously insist that 'Mr. Bryan's friends say he does not want the nomination.' But is this the real issue? The presidential nomination ought not to be regarded as a compliment to be handed to some one because he would be pleased to have it. A candidate should be selected because the rank and file of the party want him nominated —not merely because he wants the nomination. First, what will the party stand for? Second, who can best represent these principles in the campaign? These questions ought to control the selection. Men's ambitions ought not to count for much in a presidential contest."

The New York World reproduces the above editorial and complains that Mr. Bryan "leaves too much unsaid." The World then asks:

"Is he prepared to sink his own ambition for the good of the party?

"Is he prepared to let the rank and file frame the platform as well as name the candidate?"

It is, indeed, hard to satisfy the World. Its two questions are answered in the very editorial it reproduces: "The presidential nomination ought not to be regarded as a compliment to be handed to some one because he would be pleased to have it. A candidate should be selected because the rank and file of the party want him nominated—not merely because he wants the nomination."

Mr. Bryan has repeatedly said that the rank and file will frame the platform and name the candidate and no man's ambition should be allowed to interfere with that democratic method.

PLANNING FOR WAR

This is a great time for war scares. Put a uniform on a man and he writes with his sword and uses blood

for ink. A Hungarian naval expert has surveyed the field and reached the conclusion that we should

First—Create a strong fleet on the Pacific.

Second—Speedily complete the Panama canal.

Third—Increase western coast defenses and create several new bases.

Fourth—Make an immediate and extensive increase in the standing army.

And why? To resist the attack which, in the opinion of this expert, Japan is planning. And we have at home some of these "experts" whose inflamed imaginations exaggerate every Japanese into a regiment and see the Pacific coasts turned into a Japanese colony.

If our country followed the advice of jingoists and alarmists it would have the people so impoverished by preparations for war that they could not resist an attack if it ever came.

GOVERNOR HUGHES' VETO

Governor Hughes has vetoed the two-cent fare bill sent to him by the state legislature, and in doing so he has greatly pleased the newspapers which take their cue from the corporations, but he has disappointed the plain people who have expected from him more independence and moral courage. He defends his action on the ground that the legislature did not make a sufficient investigation before acting, but this excuse is hardly sufficient. He has simply given the benefit of the doubt to the railroads instead of giving it to the people, and that too, when the railroads had the right of appeal to the courts so that there was no possible chance for an injustice to be done, while the people have no appeal. In acting upon public questions men's sympathies play as important a part as their intelligence, and it is evident that the sympathies of Governor Hughes are with the railroads. It is always easy to find an excuse for doing what one wants to do, although as in this case, the excuses may be very nebulous. If Governor Hughes had been as anxious to do justice to the people as he is to

guard the railroads against injustice, he would have signed the bill and given the courts of New York a chance to suspend the law if it made an unreasonable reduction in the earnings of the roads. He confesses that he has made no investigation and that he does not know whether the law is just or not, but the protest of the railroads has more weight with him than the opinion of the representatives of the people in the New York legislature.

He refers the question to his public utilities board which he is to appoint, but if, in the appointment of the members of this board, he is as solicitious about the railroads as he is in his veto message, the people cannot expect a great deal from the board.

He seems to be afraid that the railroads might retaliate by introducing "economies in the service" and readjusting rates, etc. He seems to overlook the fact that under any efficient regulation of railroads the governments, state and national, are able to compel the railroads to meet the demands of the public. From his language it seems that he takes a hopeless view of the subject and assumes that after giving to the railroads the right of eminent domain, the people must trust the railroads to deal kindly and considerately with the public. If the people are to rely upon regulation, they will have to have more courageous representatives in office than Governor Hughes has shown himself to be.

WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT?

To the Editor of the New York World:

Accepting your kind invitation to define a democrat, I beg to say that the subject may be considered from two standpoints: First, from a party standpoint, a democrat may be defined as one who is a member of the organization known as the democratic party. A man's connection with a party is voluntary. He is at liberty to connect himself with any party or with no party, and he is known politically by the company he keeps. If he allies himself with the democratic party and votes the democratic ticket, he is entitled to be called

a democrat, in so far as that term is used as a party designation, although he may not endorse all of the party platform or be democratic in his instincts. If, in addition to voting the democratic ticket, he endorses the platform adopted by the party no one can dispute his title to the appellation democrat when the subject is viewed from the standpoint of party. A party organization has a right to choose its own name, to write its own platform, and to nominate its own candidates; and employing the word democrat in a party sense, the party has a right to withhold the name democrat from anyone who refuses to accept the party's decision without questioning the right of a person to leave his party organization at the command of his conscience and his judgment. It is only fair to say that he cannot take the party name with him if he dissents from the opinions and acts of the majority of the party, for the rule of the majority is as much a part of party government as it is a part of our theory of government. Men upon the outside may claim to be more democratic than men on the inside of the party—and under a broader definition of the word democrat they may be—and yet, from a party standpoint their claim cannot be allowed without the obliteration of party distinctions.

If, then, by your question, What is a democrat? you mean to ask for a definition from a party standpoint, I would say that a democrat is one who considers himself a member of the democratic organization, who works with the democratic organization and who expects to vote the democratic ticket. I do not mean to say that by taking part in the organization he would bind himself morally or politically to endorse any platform that might be adopted, or support any candidate who might be selected, for these questions must be left to the conscience of each voter, but when I say that he expects to support the ticket, I mean that he desires to do so and will do so unless good and sufficient reasons can be given for refusal. I may add that his membership in the democratic party cannot be thoroughly democratic unless he considers other members equally entitled with him to a voice in the party's deliberations and to an influence in the party's management. No

intelligent man becomes a member of the party with the expectation that he will agree upon all subjects with every member of the party, but he ought to expect to agree with other members on the general policy of the party and be willing to confer on equal terms with other members as to details and methods, content that the voice of the majority shall be the voice of the party unless the majority violates some fundamental principle or demands of him the surrender of a conviction.

I think, however, that your question calls for a broader consideration of the subject. If the democratic party is entitled to the name, it must be true to the ideas of democracy, and if we can for a moment lay aside party definitions I will define a democrat as one who believes in the rule of the people. The word democracy, is derived from the Greek, and the two words, demos (the people), and krateo (to rule), leave no doubt that a democracy is a government in which the people rule. A democrat, therefore, if the meaning of the name is considered, must be one who believes in the rule of the people.

This view of the subject is sustained by the writings of Jefferson. A short time before his death in a letter to Mr. Lee he said: "Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: First, those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all power from them into the hands of the higher classes; second, those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most wise depository of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist, and in every one where they are free to think, speak and write, they will declare themselves." Then speaking of the various names which had been applied in different countries to these two parties, he said: "The last appellation of aristocrats and democrats is the true one, expressing the essence of all."

It will be seen that Jefferson used the word democrat to distinguish those who have confidence in the people, and the word aristocrat to describe those who fear and distrust the people, and no one can torture the word

democrat into any other meaning or apply it accurately without considering the distinction which Jefferson points out.

What Jefferson said was true at the time he said it, and it is as true today. These two parties are to be found in every country, and no matter by what name they are known, they represent the two elements in society. Those who trust the people are everywhere endeavoring to bring the government nearer to the people and to make it more responsive to the will of the people. Those who distrust the people are everywhere endeavoring to obstruct each new step toward popular government.

We have in this country the distinction which Jefferson pointed out, and from the earliest time have had among our inhabitants both the aristocrat and the democrat. Hamilton represented the aristocratic idea of his day and proposed a plan of government which provided for a president holding office during good behavior, for senators holding office during good behavior, and for governors appointed by the federal government and holding office during good behavior. Hamilton distrusted the people and wanted to remove the government as far from the people as possible. He feared the "passions of the multitude," "the influence of the mob," etc., etc. We have some today who take Hamilton as their ideal and who, like Hamilton, distrust the people and seek to build complicated systems of representation between the people and their public servants. These, however, do not represent the mass of the voters in any party and can only be successful when they can deceive the party as to their real purpose.

Hamilton's idea was repudiated at the time of the adoption of the constitution, and the ideas of Jefferson were triumphant. The popular idea has continued to grow and the doctrines of Jefferson were never stronger than they are today. Our United States senate is more Hamiltonian in its method of election than the house, and the constant growth of sentiment in favor of the popular election of United States senators is evidence that the democratic idea is larger than the membership of any party. I can remember very well when the reso-

lution submitting the necessary constitutional amendment passed the national house of representatives for the first time. A number of democratic senators were fearful of the effects of the change; it was a new departure and they were very conservative, but time has either convinced them or forced them to keep silent, and the same influence is at work converting republican leaders or silencing them. The popular election of senators by the people was endorsed by the democratic national convention of 1900 and 1904. While the committee on resolutions spent sixteen hours on the 1904 platform, this was one question upon which there was no division of sentiment. Today a man can hardly claim to be democratic in his ideas and yet oppose the popular election of United States senators.

There is a question, however, upon which there is at present a division of opinion among democrats, namely —the initiative and the referendum or, as the system is sometimes called, direct legislation. These terms are used to describe the system which gives to the people a larger control over their own affairs by permitting them to vote directly on propositions submitted to them. This reform will not abolish representatives but it will enable the voters to coerce the representatives into obedience to the popular will. As the subject is better understood, its harmony with democracy will become more and more apparent, and I have no doubt that the time will come when the people will understand the subject of direct legislation as well as they do the popular election of senators, and then it will be as difficult for a democrat to oppose the former as it now is to oppose the latter.

While the application of the doctrine of direct legislation was naturally made to the city first and to the state afterwards, the principle applies just as well to the national government as to governments covering smaller areas. The question is, shall the people rule? And that question is as vital in the government of the nation as in the government of a state, a county or a city. Of course in the nation the equal position of the states must be respected, and it is absurd to talk of the small states being overwhelmed by a popular vote for

those who favor the application of the initiative and referendum to national questions favor it with the understanding that the people of a majority of the states as well as a majority of all the people must concur.

One who believes in the right of the people to rule and in the capacity of the people for self government naturally accepts the fundamental democratic doctrine of local self government—that is that the people can govern best where they best understand conditions. The democrat believes that the individual should be left to choose his own course except where his action would injuriously affect others, that each community should attend to its own matters, that the state should have control of state affairs and that federal government should be supreme in its sphere.

If a man is really democratic in sentiment, that is, if he really believes in the rule of the people, this belief dominates him in the consideration of all the questions that come before the people. He looks at questions from the standpoint of the whole people and not from the standpoint of a few. His conception of society is that it is built from the bottom, not from the top. While the aristocrat pictures prosperity as dripping down to the masses from the well-to-do, the democrat cannot imagine a prosperity that does not begin with the producers of wealth.

The democrat believes in applying democratic doctrine to every question. There are those who are constantly democratic, and then there are those who are democratic in spots; there are those who apply democratic principles to all questions, and there are others who apply democratic principles to some questions. It ought to be the purpose of those who engage in educational work to enlarge the number of questions to which democratic principles are applied. It is hardly worth while to waste time on one who is really aristocratic in sentiment. It is impossible to make a democrat out of him until he has a change of heart, but it is possible to show a real democrat that he has failed to apply democratic principles to a particular question. In 1896 a number of persons left our party who called themselves democrats. Some of them were aristocratic

in sentiment, and their departure was perfectly natural. They have not come back, and they will not come back so long as the democratic party is democratic, but a far greater number of those who left us in 1896 left from misunderstanding. Most of these have come back and the rest will come back. A majority of the republicans are really democratic in their fundamental ideas, and to these we can appeal if the democratic party convinces them that it can be trusted to carry out democratic principles.

To recapitulate, a democrat according to a party definition is a man who connects himself with the democratic party and acts politically with those who bear the same party name. In a broader sense, he is a democrat who believes in the rule of the people and who desires to make the government the instrument in the hands of the people to carry out their will. Such a man trusts the people and favors such reforms as will give to the people an increasing power. And a real democrat will not only favor democratic methods in government and insist upon the right of the majority to rule, but he will favor the administration of the government in the interest of the whole people according to the Jeffersonian maxim, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." If I attempted to apply these definitions to particular questions I would enter the field of controversy, but I do not understand that there is or can be any controversy over the doctrine that one is democratic when he trusts the people and undemocratic when he distrusts them.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

A WORD ON SPECULATION

The Journal of Finance, of Chicago, takes exceptions to Mr. Bryan's remarks before the board of trade and transportation in New York. In the speech referred to, Mr. Bryan said. "I want to voice the complaint of the western farmer against the form of gambling indulged in by some of your institutions. Speculating in the nec-

essaries of life is a serious thing. When the speculators, by betting, lower the price of the wheat, they hurt the farmer; when by betting they raise the price of wheat, they hurt the man who buys flour. Both the farmer and the consumer are entitled to the price fixed by the law of supply and demand, and when outsiders interfere with this law and substitute a price fixed by speculation, both the farmer and the consumer have a right to complain." The editor of the Journal of Finance makes a defense of speculation, and like all others who attempt to bolster up a weak cause, misrepresents the issue. He says: "Would he (Mr. Bryan) have congress pass a law requiring the farmers to sell their products at certain standard prices, no matter what might be the relative conditions of supply and demand? If speculators in Chicago or any other persons are willing to pay the present price of one dollar per bushel for wheat, for instance, should the farmer be compelled to sell his wheat around the prices prevailing before the recent big speculation in Chicago advanced wheat from eighty cents per bushel? On the other hand, if speculators should discount an increase in supply over demand of wheat justifying, say, a return to the price of eighty cents per bushel, should purchasers then be compelled to pay one dollar a bushel simply that wheat raisers might enjoy extraordinary prosperity at their expense?"

No one is asking for a law requiring farmers to sell their products at certain standard prices, but farmers are asking that they be protected from the men who disturb the law of supply and demand by betting on the price of other people's goods. If two men want to gamble on the future price of wheat, go into a room with a stake-holder and put up their money, they do not affect the price of the commodity, and the only question presented is a moral one, but when two men in order to make a bet go through the form of purchasing grain that they never expect to deliver and by making these speculative transactions raise or lower the price of the grain, they are interfering with the law of supply and demand and are doing injustice to those who have a right to rely upon the natural laws of trade. Then, too, speculation invites the cornering of the market. The

big speculators, not satisfied to take their chances upon their judgment, engineer deals for the purpose of compelling the market to go their way. Both the farmer and the legitimate purchaser of the product are at the mercy of the speculator, and no defense can be made of such speculation either in law or in morals. The essence and not the form of the transaction should be considered, and a speculator who, without adding anything to the supply of wheat or contributing any service of value in the transportation or distribution of the wheat, grows rich by the manipulation of the market, is as guilty from a moral standpoint as one who by the ordinary forms of larceny takes money that does not belong to him and for which he renders no service.

The editor of the Journal of Finance says: "The only real evils connected with the grain trade are the parasitical bucket shops, which have no dealings in actual commodities, but simply are gambling houses where customers place their bets on market fluctuations. If Mr. Bryan would direct his attention merely to these immoral institutions and work with his political friends to secure their suppression, and not denounce speculation in general nor deride the business of legitimate exchanges, he might perform a service of great value to the country."

Mr. Bryan is opposed to the bucket shop, not because it interferes with the board of trade gambling, but because it is doing on a small scale what some of the boards of trade do on a large scale. The evil of the bucket shop lies in the fact that it conducts gambling transactions, and it is no worse for a bucket shop to conduct gambling transactions than for the board of trade to conduct them. Boards of trade and chambers of commerce are necessary. Both the farmer and the consumer need a market place where the farmer can sell what he has to sell and where the consumer can buy what he needs to buy. When these institutions are conducted upon a legitimate basis, they are a blessing to the community, but when with legitimate transaction illegitimate transactions are mixed; when speculation pure and simple, or, more plainly speaking, gambling,

constitutes the large percentage of the transactions, the blessing of the board of trade or chamber of commerce is very much alloyed.

The injustice to the farmer and to the consumer has been mentioned, but what of the demoralizing influence of these gambling transactions upon the community at large? Every village can furnish examples of men who have been ruined by speculation on the board of trade. The fact that the small speculator must pay a commission when he buys and another when he sells whether he wins or loses insures bankruptcy in the end, and the fact that he is on the outside while the manipulators of the market are on the inside puts him in the position of playing against loaded dice. The ordinary gambling has no Journal of Finance to defend it, and yet, its work is not more destructive to morals and in some respects not so injurious to society as the gambling that is carried on in some of the chambers of commerce and boards of trade.

Mr. Bryan accepts the invitation of the editor of the Journal of Finance and will help do what he can to suppress the bucket shop. Will the editor of the Journal of Finance help to suppress the speculation which partakes of gambling and thus separate "legitimate exchanges" from the illegitimate transactions which disturb the natural laws of trade and bring widespread ruin to individuals who are lured into the game by the respectability which journals of finance throw about it.

THE TARIFF

There are some tariff reformers whom it is impossible to please. They not only want the tariff question made an issue but they want it made the only issue and, strange to say, they are for the most part men who supported President McKinley, the high priest of protection when the money question was declared by the democrats to be the paramount issue. If you talk to these tariff reformers about the trust question, they at once become conservative and express fear lest busi-

ness may be disturbed by any attack upon monopolies. If you suggest railroad regulation, they are inclined to think that enough has been done in that direction and that the subject is not very important anyhow. Even imperialism does not stir them very deeply, for what are the principles of government when compared with a tax upon the merchandise? Such tariff reformers are always complaining that the democratic party does not put enough emphasis upon the tariff question, and yet, they have spent the last twelve years in weakening the democratic party and in prophesying its annihilation. During this time, however, the democratic party has gone along including the tariff question among the issues discussed but recognizing that it was not the only issue and in two campaigns, at least, not the paramount issue. Events have increased its prominence during the last few years, and it will doubtless occupy a more conspicuous position in the next campaign than it has since 1892. The party's position on the tariff was strongly stated in '92, but the president, when elected on that platform, refused to call congress together to carry out a policy upon which the party was united, but did call congress together to force through a policy upon which the party was divided.

Tariff reform sentiment is growing. The protective principle is weaker than it has been before in a generation, and a demand for tariff reform may be more urgent than in recent years. Every excuse that has from time to time been given for the extortion practiced under the tariff schedules has been worn out, and there are now no new excuses to offer. There is no doubt that the party's position will be strongly stated in the next campaign and courageously defended, but it is not likely that the question will be declared to be paramount. It is really a part of the trust question, and the trust question cannot well be considered apart from the tariff question any more than the tariff question can be considered apart from the trust question.

The question of railroad regulation is also a part of the trust question, for the protective tariff and the railroad discrimination have contributed largely to the growth and prosperity of the trusts. These three ques-

tions are closely united, and they raise the same issue, namely—whether the government shall be administered in the interest of the whole people or in the interest of a few. The friends of tariff reform ought to join with the opponents of the trusts and the advocates of railroad regulation and make a fight for the application of democratic principles to all of these questions. There will be tariff reform enough in the next campaign to please any genuine tariff reformer, and there ought to be no quarrel as to the relative importance. They are all important, and no one interested in any one of these questions should waste his energy by abusing the persons interested in the other questions. There will be glory enough for all if a victory can be won for the democratic maxim, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

WHAT WILL IT STAND FOR?

What will the republican party stand for in the next campaign? Will its platform contain a frank and candid statement of the party's purposes, or will it contain simply a eulogy of the party's past and leave the public in doubt as to the party's intentions? When President Roosevelt was elected in 1904, his platform was about as vague and indefinite as any platform ever written. He was not committed to anything in the way of reform, and his way has been a thorny one because he was accused of attempting things which the people had not instructed him to undertake . Will the party learn a lesson from the past and instruct its next candidate as to what should be done? It is not always safe to start a commander out with sealed instructions. Such a policy may be excusable in war, but it is not defensible in the ordinary operation of government. Platforms are of no use except as they disclose the plans and purposes of those who write them. Let us have a republican platform that is explicit and definite and a candidate representative of the platform. Then if the demo-

crats will adopt the same course, we can have a contest in which the people can choose and in their choice can act intelligently.

Where does the republican party stand? What is it going to stand for? To what policies will it commit itself?

THE JAPANESE QUESTION

It is reported that the Jingoists of Japan are attempting to make political capital out of the occasional disturbances in which Japanese along the coast have been assaulted by Americans. The political opponents of the present administration in Japan are, it is said, demanding redress or war with the hope of overthrowing the ministry. It will not be creditable to the intelligence of the Japanese people if they can be led into hostility to the American people as a result of occasional clashes between Japanese and Americans. It is not necessary to state any alternative because the American sense of justice will insure the granting of any redress that the circumstances of the case may justify. It is not a very deep seated friendship that can be converted into enmity on so slight a pretext. If there is a sentiment in Japan which can be aroused to unfriendliness by an agitation started for political effect, then Japan's attachment to our country has been overestimated. The people of Japan are a reading people, and they ought to know that in a land of eighty millions of people it is not possible to prevent an occasional act of violence, and they must not charge up to the entire people the crimes of a few.

The American people have no intention of doing injustice to the Japanese or to any other people sojourning among us, but the readiness with which these incidents are seized upon and exaggerated may bring an entirely different result from that expected or desired by Japan. If the admission of the Japanese is to subject us to the danger of a war, many will be brought to oppose Japanese immigration who have heretofore been indifferent upon the subject. Our nation cannot afford to admit

people whose presence here is likely to become a cause of war. No benefits that Japanese immigration can confer upon us can compensate for a foreign war or for constant diplomatic complications. The more the Japanese politicians threaten war and reprisal, the more they encourage an anti-Japanese sentiment in the United States. The American people want to live on terms of friendship with all nations. They have taken a pride in the progress of Japan because they feel that they have contributed somewhat to that progress by their example and advice. They are so anxious to remain on friendly terms with Japan that they will oppose immigration with great unanimity if immigration is found to be a source of irritation. The statesmen of Japan are short-sighted, indeed, if they think they can improve Japan's relations with the United States by an exaggeration of every difficulty that occurs between a Japanese and an American. This is an unfriendly attitude, and nothing but friendship can beget friendship.

MR. BRYAN ON CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Bryan's speech at New York meeting of Publicity Organization:

I am very much interested in the movement which this meeting represents, and I appreciate the strong part that the chairman, Mr. Belmont, is taking in it. I had a conversation with him more than two years ago, when he prepared a paper, I think for the North American Review, on this subject. I have been interested in all that he has done since, and I want to lend whatever influence I may have to the carrying out of the idea that this movement presents. It rests upon the theory that politics should be honest, and while no one will dispute the proposition, there is not at times as much enthusiasm in favor of the proposition when concretely applied, as there ought to be. There can be no honest politics where any interest in the country can purchase

before the election a promise that certain things will be done after the election, and the promise be concealed from the voters.

If I understand our theory of government, it assumes that those in office represent the people who put them in office, and we write platforms for no other purpose than to announce to the public in advance what the candidates will do if elected. We go before the country and we solicit the support of the people upon the condition, and only upon the condition, that they want carried out the things that are stated in the platform. And it is the purpose of those who write the platforms, or should be, to state the party's position on all the questions that are likely to be acted on by those who are elected. Now that is the basis of our reasoning in this matter, and it is not honest politics for a party to write a platform, nominate a ticket and go out and appeal to the voters to support that ticket because of that platform, if there is a secret understanding that some other policy will be carried out.

The objection to the campaign funds that are contributed secretly, and spent secretly, is that they are contributed for a purpose that the public does not understand, and to carry out a policy against the public. That is the objection we have to campaign contributions contributed and expended secretly. This question would not arise but for the existence in this country of great corporations that have an interest in legislation. If we had no corporations the chances are that no individual would be personally and pecuniarily interested enough in legislation to contribute any large amount—that is, larger than his patriotic impulse would lead him to contribute. But when we have great corporations that not only receive their charters from the government, but even ask favors of legislatures, or if they do not ask favors of the legislatures, ask immunity from the executive—because we have these great corporations, it has become the custom to run campaigns with funds supplied secretly and used secretly; after the election the people who subscribed the funds dominate the government and the people who do the voting are betrayed by those for whom they voted.

That is the situation, and before a remedy can be suggested the situation must be understood. Now, this evil has not been confined to one party. A very interesting bit of testimony was brought out in the investigation of the sugar trust.

Mr. Havemeyer testified that he had been in the habit of contributing to campaign funds, to one party in one state, to another party in another state, according to the political complexion of the state.

How are you going to stop it? In the first place, a law making it unlawful for a corporation to contribute to a campaign fund will go a good ways. But that is not sufficient. I would not be willing to stop at that—to merely prevent a corporation from contributing to campaign funds. If we had a law forbidding corporations to contribute to campaign funds you would find that there were no corporations that contributed, but that individuals did, who represented the corporations. And it is too difficult a task to show that the individual gets the money out of the corporation to make the contribution, for if a few men conrol the corporation, the man at the head of it may pay the money out of his own pocket today and he may not be reimbursed for two or three or five years hence. If evasions of that kind are possible, the law is not sufficient.

What else is necessary? I believe there is one thing possible. That is that the large contributions, no matter from whom they come, shall be made known; for when we see the head of a trust, or other corporation interested in legislation, contributing a large sum of money we know that he is not doing it for himself, but that he is doing it for the corporation, or because of his interest therein, and that he expects to get back in legislation more than he contributed to the campaign fund.

If we are going to have publications, which I regard as necessary, then another question arises. When shall the publication be made? Now I want to present a thought on this phase of the subject. I believe that the publication should be made before the election, and I will tell you why. In a campaign the parties may deny that they are getting any money at all from corporations or from persons representing or acting for corpo-

rations or interested in corporations. I have known statements of that kind to be made when they were not founded on fact, and I am afraid we have not had such a regeneration of the individual that they might not be made in the future. And when the published statement is delayed until after the election what redress have the people? The sale has been made; the men have been elected. The people cannot recall their votes. What can they do then? Wait until the next election. It would be claimed at the next election by the party guilty of the offense that the persons in charge of the last campaign were put out and an entirely new set pledged to reform put in and thus the people might be fooled again. And the party that can get into power usually has enough men to keep up the delusion. And of course after two or three campaigns they are changed and they come back and use the first set again, because by that time these are supposed to have a change of heart so that they would not again do wrong.

My faith in the doctrine that you can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time was a little shaken by an explanation I once heard, namely, that it is not necessary to fool all the people all the time. Fool some this year and some next, and some the next, and then the fourth year you can fool the first set again.

The only way I see out of it is to compel the publication BEFORE THE ELECTION, and then when the people see where the campaign money is coming from they will have a right to form their opinion as to the reason for the contribution. It seems to me that an important part of this measure ought to be a provision that—I will not attempt to fix any time arbitrarily, but say on the first of October—a statement shall be made of all contributions and expenditures up to that time. I will not say that it is necessary to include small contributions, so small that they may be assumed to come from persons animated by patriotism and by a general interest in the subject under discussion. The minimum should be fixed. That limit should not be so high as to permit any great contributions to be made, or any amount that would raise the suspicion of a pecuniary

interest to be subserved. Then, say, ten days before the election there should be filed a supplemental statement giving the contributions up to that time, and expenditures, and it should be unlawful for any person to make a contribution after the last day of publication.

Now, I believe that if in our plan we include the publication of these sums, say, thirty days, and then ten days before, and then make it a penal offense for any person to subscribe to any campaign fund after that time, we will meet the most difficult part of this question. After the election there would be the final statement that would include the expenditures after the last day, for, to my mind, the expenditures are not so important as the contributions. You cannot spend money until you get it, and the source from which you get it is, to my mind, all important. It is very much easier to correct evils in the spending of money than in the collection of money.

There is just one other thought on this question. I do not believe in doing things half-way. If honesty in politics is the object desired, then there ought to be no half-way measures.

And I suggest this additional thought, namely, that the notice of contributions shall be given not only by the committee which receives them, but by the person who contributes. I would require, if I had my way about it, that every person who made a contribution to a campaign fund above the minimum, so much that the law declared his contribution should be known, within a very brief period of time after the contribution was made, file a statement of it, either at his home post-office, or at the United States court, or at some fixed place; so that you would have two methods. In all our treasury departments and in the payments of money we have checks one on the other, and I think that this is a good place for the check. We ought to have the committee's statement when it receives the money, and the man's when he contributes it, and in that way we will have the one testifying against the other.

And then I would make it a criminal offense if the man who contributed or the committee who received it,

did not make the statement. And, my friends, nothing but the criminal law is going to be sufficient. But if we provide that it shall be a penal offense for giving without notice, and a penal offense for a committee to receive without giving notice of it, I believe we will go to the root of the matter.

There may be differences as to the best thing to do, but, my friends, when the people want this done they will do the best thing that is proposed. When you give the presumption to the people in favor of honest government you will not hesitate to make laws strong enough and clear enough so that the people can know who is enough interested in any particular success to put up large sums of money to secure a victory.

When you have stopped the purchase of legislation from legislatures, and the purchase of immunity from executive officers, reforms will be possible. We may differ as to what reforms are necessary; but there ought to be no difference on this proposition—that the people have a right to do what they want in government, whether they want what I want or what you want. Republicans and democrats and all parties, if they believe in our theory of government, ought to believe that no matter how honestly or how deeply we may differ in opinion, we ought to be willing to let the people have what they want in government. Let the people rule; and if the people make mistakes remember that the people have a right to make mistakes. Most of the bad government in the past has arisen from the idea that a few people ought to be allowed to make the mistakes for the rest. Let the people make their own mistakes, and you will find that the majority will rectify them. We can get before them measures of reform, we can try to persuade them to accept that which we believe to be the best reform, but back of every man who speaks and every man who votes there ought to be the patriotic sentiment that prefers the triumph of that which is right to that which he may think to be right, if he is in fact wrong.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT SPREADS

The House of Commons by a vote of 432 to 147 adopted Premier Campbell-Bannerman's resolution declaring that the House of Lords should be shorn of its veto power. This is a step toward popular government—a part of the world-wide movement which has for its object the bringing of government nearer to the people. The House of Lords will oppose the resolution, of course, but if it is made an issue and carries at the polls the premier can doubtless secure the appointment of enough life peers to give the government a majority and thus reduce the hereditary body to the capacity of an advisor.

The king of England is a mere figurehead; his duties are social and diplomatic. While he has a veto power he would not dare to exercise it. The House of Lords is the stronghold of the aristocracy; its members own two-thirds of the farm land of England and they block reform legislation. The struggle between the aristocracy and the democracy was bound to come and Americans will welcome this new evidence that the whole earth is some day to enjoy the blessings of a "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP NOT AN ISSUE

As the campaign approaches it becomes more and more evident that of the economic questions, three—the trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question—will share public attention, and these three really present the same issue between the general public and the privileged classes. Shall the government be administered in the interest of the whole people or in the interest of a few? This is the issue presented by the trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question.

Government ownership is not an immediate issue. A large majority of the people still hope for effective

regulation, and while they so hope, they will not consider ownership. While many democrats believe—and Mr. Bryan is one of the number—that public ownership offers the ultimate solution of the problem, still, those who believe that the public will finally in self defense be driven to ownership, recognize that regulation must be tried under the most favorable circumstances before the masses will be ready to try a more radical remedy.

Regulation cannot be sufficiently tried within the next year, and there is no desire anywhere to make government ownership an issue in 1908. Mr. Bryan fully agrees with those who believe that it would be unwise to turn attention from regulation, on which the people are ready to act, to government ownership, upon which the people are not ready to act. To inject the government ownership question into the next campaign would simply give representatives of the railroads a chance to dodge the issue of regulation and deceive the public.

So far, the railroads have been successful in preventing effective federal regulation, and state regulation has, as a rule, been restrained by the United States courts. It is about twenty years since the interstate commerce commission was created. It required about ten years for the courts to find out that the powers conferred were insufficient, and then it took about ten years to secure an amendment. The railroads fought the amendment at every step, and the president was finally forced to compromise with the railroad republicans in the senate in order to secure their support. Even that amendment, secured after tremendous effort, falls short of what it should be. It aims to stop rebates and passes —and the railroads profit pecuniarily by both the stoppage of rebates and the prohibition of passes—but extortionate rates still exist, and state legislation for the reduction of rates has resulted in an agitation on the part of the railroads for legislation which will deprive the state of authority and centralize all regulation in congress. The democratic party must meet the issue presented; it must resist the encroachments upon the authority of the states. It must insist upon the exercise of federal power for the regulation of interstate commerce, and it must insist upon the exercise of state

authority for the exercise of all of the power vested in the state. This question has grown in importance during the past year and its prominence will be increased if any attempt is made to impair state authority. The republican party is as impotent to regulate the railroads as it is to exterminate the trusts and to reform the tariff.

The democratic party has in three national campaigns demanded effective railroad regulation, while the republican national platforms have been silent upon the subject. The president has partially adopted the democratic view on this subject, but so far the republican leaders have resolutely opposed it. The president is helping to educate the people up to the need of railroad regulation but his party, under its present leadership, is powerless to accomplish this or any other important reform. If the democratic party will clearly and unequivocally demand, first, the ascertaining of the value of all the railroads; second, the preventing of overcapitalization; and third, the reduction of rates to a point where they will yield only a reasonable return upon the real value of the roads—if the party will do this, it will commend itself not only to democrats but to those republicans who have been led to study the railroad question. The railroad situation presents a vital issue, and the issue should be so stated that everyone can understand the party's position. While democrats may differ as to the relative importance of the trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question, all must agree that the party must take the side of the common people on all three questions.

Let the line be drawn between those who want to make this a government of the people, by the people and for the people and those who want it to be a government of the corporations, by the corporations and for the corporations.

ANOTHER ORATOR

Another orator, Marciline Albert, has arisen. This time it is France that produces the man with persuasive

tongue. Like all other orators he is the product of his environment; he is the voice of his people and simply gives expression to their sense of justice. Seeing what he regarded as a great wrong he went from village to village awakening the people to the dangers which confronted them. Seven years ago he began his agitation and, gradually growing in influence, as the vine growers recognized the truth embodied in his arguments he became the leader of those whose cause he was pleading. He was eloquent because he knew his subject and felt that he had a message that must be delivered.

Those who are ambitious to win distinction in public speaking can find a lesson in Albert's career—and it is a more valuable lesson than can be obtained in the schools of oratory. The man who attaches himself to a just cause and studies it until his mind is filled with argument and his heart is aflame with earnestness—such a man will not lack for hearers. And, it may be added, our own country and our own generation present causes enough to grow a large army of orators if our young men will forget themselves in their devotion to the common weal.

O, for a crop of American Alberts who, seeing the menace of plutocracy, will become the champions of a democracy which will restore the government to its old foundations, and administer it according to the Jeffersonian maxim, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none!"

THE DEMOCRATIC OUTLOOK

A number of large dailies which oscillate between the two parties and attempt to dictate the policy of both, are just now taking a gloomy view of democratic prospects. The dismal hue is due to the fact that the democratic party does not seem disposed to allow these papers to write the platform and select the ticket, and very naturally the papers are hopeless. These are the same papers which three years ago conducted a conservative campaign, rejoiced over a conservative victory at St. Louis, gave advice to the party during the campaign,

and prophesied certain victory just before the overwhelming defeat. They are now laying the foundation for a bolt in case they are not allowed to dominate the party's counsels, but the memory of their leadership is so fresh in the minds of the people that their ability to deceive is reduced to a minimum.

The fact is that democratic prospects, instead of being gloomy, are bright and growing brighter. The democratic position has been vindicated as shown by events, and second, by the admission of republicans. Every proposition for which the democratic party stood in 1896 has been proved sound, and not a republican policy but is weaker today than it was then. In 1896 the democrats contended that the country needed more money; this was denounced as a wild and inexcusable theory by sage financiers, and yet, with an increase in money of more than fifty per cent per capita, we have none too much money now, and the larger volume of money has increased prices and brought prosperity. What would be our industrial condition today if we had no more money today than in 1896, when the republicans said we had enough?

The party's position on the trust question has been demonstrated to be sound, and every day increases the number of those who believe as the democratic platform in 1900 stated, that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

The party's position on the tariff question is vindicated. Our protected manufacturers, by selling abroad in competition with the world, admit that they do not need the tariff to compete at home. There are more tariff reformers in the United States today than there ever were before.

The party's position on the railroad question is vindicated. It has been demanding regulation for more than ten years, and the unanimity of the sentiment in favor of regulation shows how strong the democratic position is. The president has secured a little regulation but very little compared with what the country needs.

Our party's position on the labor question is vindicated. We demanded arbitration in three campaigns,

and arbitration grows stronger each year. We denounced government by injunction in 1896. The abuse of this writ becomes more and more apparent.

Events have vindicated the party's position on imperialism, and the best informed republicans now admit that ultimate independence is the only solution of the Philippine question.

The president has even adopted the democratic doctrine of an income tax and is favoring an inheritance tax also to prevent the transmission of the swollen fortunes to the next generation. When has a party in power lost in popularity so rapidly as the republican party has? When has a party out of power increased its strength more rapidly than the democratic party has? And it is a positive and aggressive democracy—not a timid corporation democracy—that has coerced the administration into the adoption of democratic ideas.

If a party is strong in proportion as its principles are strong, then the democratic party is growing rapidly in strength. If the people like democratic policies when those policies are put into operation by republicans, they cannot greatly fear them when put into operation by democrats.

But there is another indication of victory. The democratic party is more united than it has been for many years, and this unity is due to two causes. In the first place the money question, which defeated the democrats in 1896, is out of the way. The advocates of the gold standard have kept the gold standard, and the advocates of more money have secured from new discoveries of gold the increase that they sought to secure from the restoration of bimetallism. There is no division in the democratic party among the rank and file. There are a few papers under the control of favor-seeking corporations and a few salaried attorneys who would make the democratic party the tool of predatory wealth, but they are impotent to carry out their plans. While the democratic party is united, the republican party is more divided than it has been in recent years, and this division cannot be healed. The standpatter and the republican reformer are at outs, and their controversy grows more bitter. The republican reformer is

shouting that something must be done, and the standpatter, his hands to the elbows in the pocket of the public says, "let well enough alone." No matter what the republican party does, it cannot please both sides. All that the democratic party has to do is to be loyal to the interests of the people and make a strong fight on a strong platform and victory is within its reach.

A RAILROAD VIEW

The Kansas City Journal says: "The veriest tyro in the railroad business ought to know, and every business man in or out of it does know, that the value of a railroad has nothing to do with the rates it charges for traffic."

This is refreshing. There are at least three plans upon which railroad rates can be based. First, on what the traffic will bear; second, on the rates fixed by other roads, and third, on a basis of value with a view to earning a reasonable return on the money invested. If rates are fixed according to what the traffic will bear, then the railroad is in the class with highwaymen and takes whatever it can secure without stopping to ask what is just. If it bases its rates upon competition with other rates, all it has to do is to enter into agreement with the other competitors and then it can join with them in charging whatever the traffic will bear. If the competition is protected, then its rates must have some connection with the value of the property unless the competing roads are in a position to ignore values and substitute an arbitrary basis of rates. If the railroad is a common carrier and permitted to exercise the right of eminent domain on the ground that it partakes of a public character, it cannot justify the charging of higher rates than necessary to secure a reasonable return upon the investment. To say that a railroad costing $25,000 a mile has a right to collect dividends on fifty or seventy-five thousand a mile, or, as in some cases, on $100,000 a mile, is to deny that the railroad owes any obligation whatever to the public.

The language quoted from the Kansas City Journal was used in answer to Mr. Bryan's suggestion that we must first ascertain the value of the railroads because it is impossible to determine what rates are reasonable until we know upon what investment the railroads should be permitted to earn a profit. Mr. Bryan expected that the Journal would be opposed to the valuation of railroads but he did not expect that paper to frankly admit that in the opinion of its editor the value of the road had nothing to do with the rates. Objection has been made to the subsidizing of newspapers, and yet, like all other evils, this evil has some compensating advantages. Only a subsidized newspaper or a paper run in the interest of the railroads would present so unreasonable an objection to the valuation of the roads. It is possibly fortunate that the extreme railroad position is thus stated so that the voters can understand what they have to oppose. If they get any reforms, they will have to fight for them, and they can fight better when they understand how little concession they can expect from those who dominate the great corporations and use them for the exactment of toll from the public.

WINNING BY JUSTICE

The president has authorized Secretary of State Root to notify the Chinese ambassador that he will recommend the reduction of the indemnity agreed upon at the close of the boxer trouble. The indemnity claimed by the United States was $24,440,000 and some six millions have been paid. It has been found that $11,000,000 will cover our loss and expense incurred, and the president will ask congress to reduce the amount to the actual loss incurred.

This is an act of justice which very naturally impresses the Chinese with our fairness and the Chinese ambassador has, in eloquent words, expressed his nation's gratitude. Our nation strengthens its position when it gives evidence of its desire to do justice to all

in its international dealings and the president has made no mistake in reaching the conclusion which has been announced.

Some forty years ago our government voluntarily reduced an indemnity which Japan was paying and the Japanese always speak of it in extending a welcome to an American. As nations collect indemnity by force it is the more important that they should scrupulously avoid anything like extortion. Our nation sets a splendid example in refusing to accept more than the damages actually suffered and time will demonstrate that from a commercial standpoint as well as from the standpoint of morals it pays for our government to be just.

FAR-REACHING CORPORATE INFLUENCE

The investigations which have been going on during the last few years have brought to light many iniquities. The source of corruption funds has been exposed and the inner workings of high finance revealed. Some day the investigation will be carried into the courts and we shall learn whether the judges who preside at the trial of corporations have any pecuniary interest in the cases which come before them—not necessarily in the particular case, but in the result which follows important decisions. It is now more than ten years since Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota, in a speech in the United States senate, called attention to the fact that when a suit was brought in New York for the purpose of dissolving the joint traffic association, it was found that only one judge out of the eight judges in that circuit was qualified to try the case because of the others holding stocks or bonds of some of the railroads that were defendants. The far-reaching influence of the great corporations is not fully recognized. It is not easy for a judge to be absolutely impartial when his decision may affect the value of his own property. One of the objections to allowing watered stock to be issued is that when issued, it gets into the hands of people who regard themselves as innocent purchasers—even though

they might have informed themselves by investigation—and such persons regard any attack upon the corporation as an attack upon their vested rights.

NOT A MATTER OF AMBITION

Those who urge the nomination of a "conservative" candidate by the democratic convention studiously insist that "Mr. Bryan's friends say he does not want the nomination." But is this the real issue? The presidential nomination ought not to be regarded as a compliment to be handed to some one because he would be pleased to have it. A candidate should be selected because the rank and file of the party WANT HIM NOMINATED—not merely because he wants the nomination. First, what will the party stand for? Second, who can best represent these principles in the campaign? These questions ought to control the selection. Men's ambitions ought not to count for much in a presidential contest.

LAWSON'S REMEDY

In a recent issue of Everybody's Magazine Mr. Lawson concludes his series of articles on Frenzied Finance and announces that he will follow his exposure of Wall Street's doings with a series of short stories. He explains that he does this to maintain interest in the subject until he is ready to set forth his "remedy." He says that the remedy is withheld because the people are not ready for it—that the psychological moment has not arrived. Few will agree with him as to the wisdom of withholding any remedy which he has in mind. It would do no harm to submit it; if it is good the sooner it is given to the public the better. He must not expect immediate acceptance, and time wasted cannot be recovered. He ought to say what he has to say and trust the people to act upon his remedy according to its merits.

It is not certain, however, that he has actually withheld the remedy. He intimates that it is to be found in legislation limiting dividends and preventing the issue of fictitious stock. He says:

"Ergo, if instead of trying to prevent these rascals from getting these millions, which we can never do because by using this vast wealth they can corrupt people faster than we, without it, can reform them, let us make it impossible for them to create the stocks and bonds without which they cannot seize the loot that the rebate system takes from the people. Does any one suppose that 'Standard Oil' and Harriman last month would have taken all the risks attending the Union Pacific and Southern Pacific coup, which has brought on their heads a whirlwind of wrath from the press and the pulpit, if they had not known that they could thus easily seize scores of millions of dollars? If the law of the land had made it impossible for 'Standard Oil' and the 'System' to gather millions of profit, there would have been no incentive for Harriman to take advantage of the tremendous business arising out of the great prosperity of the country, by collecting from passengers and freight passing over his roads millions of dollars more than the running expenses and a fair rate of interest called for. Therefore, when business increased with the country's prosperity, Harriman would have reduced freight and passenger rates and these extra millions would have remained in the hands of the people along the line of these two roads."

Both of these suggestions are good, but they are not new. Texas has an excellent law regulating the issue of stock and it has already been discussed in connection with the federal regulation of railroads. The democratic platform of 1900 endorsed the federal license system as a remedy for trusts, the license to be withheld until necessary conditions were complied with.

The fixing of a maximum dividend would be an effective remedy. If, in the case of railroads, the corporations can be brought down to an honest basis and limited to reasonable dividends the incentive to speculation would be removed, or at least greatly reduced. If these

are the remedies upon which Mr. Lawson depends he ought to give the public a chance to consider and discuss them.

EVADING THE LAW

A reminder of the "crushing" of the Northern Securities company is being given in Nebraska. The recent legislature enacted a law prohibiting brewers from engaging in the retail liquor business or renting property owned by them for saloon purposes. The brewers of the state owned many saloons which were in the names of agents acting for them. Now the brewers are evading the law by organizing "holding companies" and turning over their real estate to them. These companies will then do for the brewers what the brewers did for themselves before the enactment of the law. That is the way President Roosevelt and Attorney-General Knox "busted" the famous merger of the Northern Pacific, Great Northern and Burlington railroads. They brought suit in the United States court—after the legal department of Minnesota had blazed the way and made national action imperative—and secured a decision dissolving the merger. The merger dissolved as a merger but immediately organized as something else, and whatever that something else is, its results are just the same as the results of the old merger. When a striking workingman is enjoined by a federal court he is jailed without a hearing if he violates the injunction. The trust magnate is enjoined from doing a certain thing under a certain name and straightway proceeds to do the same thing under a different name, and the legal department of the government is so busy boasting of its victory that it overlooks the repetition of the offense.

THE JINGOES AT WORK

The Jingoes in the United States and Japan are doing their best to stir up a war sentiment. When a loud-mouthed Japanese booster issues a challenge it is taken

up by some swaggering American and threats are tossed back and forth across the ocean. What occasion is there for war or war talk? If any Japanese has suffered violence our courts are open to him; no foreigner will be denied redress for any injury he may suffer. Japan has no complaint against us and we have no complaint against her.

Why this massing of our fleet on the Pacific? Is it just to show Japan what we could do? If so, it is a bombastic display unworthy of us; if it has no connection with the Japanese question it is unpatriotic for sensational papers to represent it as an evidence of either hostility or fear. In both countries the advocates of a large navy will seize upon the incident as an excuse for demanding more warships, but to just and peace-loving citizens the situation ought to be a warning against the military spirit which a large navy develops. It is popular just now to urge shooting galleries, rifle ranges and big battleships as peace promoters, but it is as absurd to expect these things to bring peace as it would be to expect personal encounters to be decreased by the teaching of prize fighting in the public schools.

Man is not yet sufficiently advanced to have power without yielding to the temptation to use it. It has been wisely remarked that only the burglar needs burglar tools. If our nation intends to respect the rights of other nations it does not need "the biggest navy in the world." Our resources are well known; if we are ever unjustly attacked we can prove our power of resistance, but the chances of attack are very remote and nothing is more apt to provoke an attack than the parading of our preparedness.

FAITH

SUBSTANCE OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. BRYAN AT VARIOUS COLLEGE COMMENCEMENTS

[The following is the substance of the address delivered by Mr. Bryan during the last three months at the graduating exercises of the Nebraska State Normal

at Peru, at the graduating exercises of Cotner university, near Lincoln, and at Harvard, Dartmouth, Bowdoin, the Washington and Jefferson college, the William and Mary college, Columbia university, and the state universities of Texas, Minnesota and Virginia.]

Faith exerts a controlling influence over our lives. If it is argued that works are more important than faith, I reply that faith comes first, work afterwards. Until one believes, he does not act, and in accordance with his faith, so will be his deeds.

Abraham, called of God, went forth in faith to establish a race and a religion. As a result of his faith a race has been produced not surpassed in its achievements by any other race in history, and as a result of his faith nearly four hundred millions of human beings are adherents of a monotheistic religion. It was faith that led Columbus to discover America, and faith again that conducted the early settlers to Jamestown, the Dutch to New York and the Pilgrims to Plymouth Rock. Faith has led the pioneer across deserts and through trackless forests, and faith has brought others in his footsteps to lay in our land the foundations of a civilization the highest that the world has known.

I might draw an illustration from the life of each one of you. You have faith in education, and that faith is behind your study; you have faith in this institution, and that faith brought you here; your parents and friends have had faith in you and have helped you to your present position. Without faith we are told it is impossible to please God, and I may add that without faith it is impossible to meet the expectations of those who are most interested in you. Let me present this subject under four heads:

First—You must have faith in yourselves. Not that you should carry confidence in yourselves to the point of displaying egotism, and yet, egotism is not the worst possible fault. My father was wont to say that if a man had the big head, you could whittle it down, but that if he had the little head, there was no hope for him. If you have the big head, others will help you reduce it, but if you have the little head, they cannot help you. You must believe that you can do things or

you will not undertake them. Those who lack faith attempt nothing and therefore cannot possibly succeed; those with great faith attempt the seemingly impossible and by attempting prove what man can do.

But you cannot have faith in yourselves unless you are conscious that you are prepared for your work. If one is feeble in body, he cannot have the confidence in his physical strength that the athlete has, and as physical strength is necessary, one is justified in devoting to exercise and to the strengthening of the body such time as may be necessary.

Intellectual training is also necessary, and more necessary than it used to be. When but few had the advantages of a college education, the lack of such advantages was not so apparent. Now when so many of the lawyers, physicians, journalists, and even business men, are college graduates, one cannot afford to enter any field without the best possible intellectual preparation. When one comes into competition with his fellows, he soon recognizes his own intellectual superiority or inferiority as compared with others. In China they have a very interesting bird contest. The singing lark is a very popular bird there, and as you go along the streets of a Chinese city you see Chinamen out airing their birds. These singing larks are entered in contests, and the contests are decided by the birds themselves. If, for instance, a dozen are entered, they all begin to sing lustily, but as they sing, one after another recognizes that it is outclassed and gets down off of its perch, puts its head under its wing and will not sing any more. At last there is just one bird left singing, and it sings with an enthusiasm that shows that it recognizes its victory. So it is in all intellectual contests. Put twenty men in the room and let them discuss any important question. At first all will take part in the discussion, but as the discussion proceeds, one after another drops out until finally two are left in debate, one on one side and one on the other. The rest are content to have their ideas presented by those who can present them best. If you are going to have faith, therefore, in yourselves, you

must be prepared to meet your competitors upon an equal plane, and if you are prepared, they will be conscious of it as well as you.

A high purpose is a necessary part of your preparation. You cannot afford to put a low purpose in competition with a high one. If you go out to work from a purely selfish standpoint, you will be ashamed to stand in the presence of those who have higher aims and nobler ambitions. Have faith in yourselves, but to have faith you must be prepared for your work, and this preparation must be moral and intellectual as well as physical.

Second—Have faith in mankind. The great fault of our scholarship is that it is not sufficiently sympathetic. It holds itself aloof from the struggling masses. It is too often cold and cynical. It is better to trust your fellowmen and be occasionally deceived than to be distrustful and live alone. Mankind deserves to be trusted. There is something good in every one, and that good responds to sympathy. If you speak to the multitude and they do not respond, do not despise them, but rather examine what you have said. If you speak from your heart, you will speak to their hearts, and they can tell very quickly whether you are interested in them or simply in yourself. The heart of mankind is sound; the sense of justice is universal. Trust it, appeal to it, do not violate it. People differ in race characteristics, in national traditions, in language, in ideas of government, and in forms of religion, but at heart they are very much alike. I fear the plutocracy of wealth; I respect the plutocracy of learning; I thank God for the democracy of the heart. You must love if you would be loved. "They loved Him because He first loved them"—this is the verdict pronounced where men have unselfishly labored for the welfare of the whole people. Link yourselves in sympathy with your fellowmen; mingle with them; know them and you will trust them and they will trust you. If you are stronger than others, bear heavier loads; if you are more capable than others, show it by your willingness to perform a larger service.

Third—If you are going to accomplish anything in this country, you must have faith in our form of gov-

ernment, and there is every reason why you should have faith in it. It is the best form of government ever conceived by the mind of man, and it is spreading throughout the world. It is best, not because it is perfect, but because it can be made as perfect as the people deserve to have. It is a people's government, and it reflects the virtue and intelligence of the people. As the people make progress in virtue and in intelligence, the government ought to approach more and more nearly to perfection. Not that it will ever be free from faults, because it must be administered by human beings, and imperfection is to be expected in the work of human hands.

Jefferson said a century ago that there were naturally two parties in every country, one which drew to itself those who trusted the people, the other those who distrusted the people. That was true when Jefferson said it, and it is true today. In every country there is a party which is seeking to enlarge the participation of the people in government, and that party is the growing party. In every country there is a party which is endeavoring to obstruct each step toward popular government, and it is the dying party. In this country the tendency is constantly toward more popular government, and every effort which has for its object the bringing of the government into closer touch with the people is sure of ultimate triumph.

Our form of government is good. Call it a democracy if you are a democrat, or a republic if you are a republican, but help to make it a government of the people, by the people and for the people. A democracy is wiser than an aristocracy because a democracy can draw from the wisdom of the people, and all of the people know more than any part of the people. A democracy is stronger than a monarchy because, as the historian, Bancroft, has said: "It dares to discard the implements of terror and build its citadel in the hearts of men." And a democracy is the most just form of government because it is built upon the doctrine that men are created equal, that governments are instituted to

protect the inalienable rights of the people and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We know that a grain of wheat planted in the ground will, under the influence of sunshine and rain, send forth a blade and then a stalk, and then the full head, and we know that there is behind the grain of wheat a force irresistible and constantly at work. There is behind moral economy and political truth a force equally irresistible and always operating, and just as we may expect the harvest in due season, we may be sure of the triumph of these eternal forces that make the man's uplifting. Have faith in your form of government, for it rests upon a growing idea, and if you will but attach yourself to that idea, you will grow with it.

But the subject presents itself in another aspect. You must not only have faith in yourselves, in humanity and in the form of government under which we live, but if you would do a great work, you must have faith in God. Do not call me a preacher, for I am but a layman; yet, I am not willing that the minister shall monopolize the blessings of Christianity, and I do not know of any moral precept binding upon the preacher behind the pulpit that is not binding upon those who occupy the pews. And I do not know of any moral truth binding upon the Christian whose acceptance would not be helpful to everyone. I am not speaking from the minister's standpoint but from the observation of everyday life when I say that there is a wide difference between the desire to live so that men will applaud you and the desire to live so that God will be satisfied with you. Man needs the inner strength that comes from faith in God and belief in His constant presence. The man who is trying to be good so that men will see him is sure to come upon the time when he thinks that the world is not looking and that he can take a vacation. Then he falls. The man who believes that God's eye is ever upon him, and endeavors to live as in the sight of God, is not looking for a vacation and is not so apt to stumble. We are weak enough in the presence of temptation even when fortified by faith in God. How

helpless and hopeless we are if we do not admit responsibility to a personal God.

Man needs faith in God, therefore, to strengthen him in his hours of trial, and he needs it to give him courage to do the work of life. How can one fight for a principle unless he believes in the triumph of the right? How can he believe in the triumph of the right if he does not believe that God stands back of the truth and that God is able to bring victory to truth? The man of faith, believing that every word spoken for truth will have its influence and that no blow struck for righteousness is struck in vain, fights on without asking whether he is to fall in the beginning of the battle or to live to join in the shouts of triumph. He knows not whether he is to live for the truth or to die for it, and if he has the faith he ought to have, he is as ready to die for it as to live for it.

Faith will not only give you strength when you fight for righteousness, but your faith will bring dismay to your enemies. There is power in the presence of an honest man who does right because it is right and dares to do the right in the face of all opposition. It is true today, and has been true through all history, that "One with God shall chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight."

If your preparation is complete so that you feel conscious of your ability to do great things; if you have faith in your fellowmen and become a colaborer with them in the raising of the general level of society; if you have faith in our form of government and seek to purge it of its imperfections so as to make it more and more acceptable to our own people and to the oppressed of other nations; and if in addition you have faith in God and in the triumph of the right, no one can set limits to your achievements. This is the greatest of all the ages in which to live. The railroads and the telegraph wires have brought the corners of the earth close together, and it is easier today for one to be helpful to the whole world than it was a few centuries ago to be helpful to the inhabitants of a single valley. This is

the age of great opportunity and of great responsibility. Let your faith be large, and let this large faith inspire you to perform a large service.

RAILROAD MAGNATES PLEASED

Those who regard the present railroad regulation as sufficient ought to read the letter which William E. Curtis wrote recently to the Chicago Record-Herald. He says that the managers of corporations "are becoming reconciled to the new policy of government control," and that "there is an almost universal approval of the law prohibiting rebates, both among shippers and railway managers." He says that "the big railway managers also declare that they are glad that free passes are abolished." As to rebates, it is not strange that the railroads should be pleased, for they are now saving the money that they used to pay to favored shippers. Of course there were instances in which the managers were pecuniarily interested in the corporations or firms which had rebates, but probably in most cases the railroads were sandbagged into the making of concessions by the trusts, and they now find a profit in the law which protects them from the sandbagging process.

It is certain, too, that the pass business was carried to a point where the railroads were greatly annoyed. While they were perfectly willing to give passes to public officials in the hope of making those officials friendly in matters of legislation, the public officials were constantly asking the railroads for passes for friends. The cutting off of passes was a relief to the railroads and a help to the treasuries of the roads. No wonder the railroad managers easily reconciled themselves to a law which increased their freight earnings by the cutting off of rebates and their passenger receipts by the cutting off of passes. But what of the general public? Is it not to have some share in the benefits? Must the people make a long and persistent fight for the control of railroads only to find that the railroads monopolize the benefits?

The federal government so far has not gone very far in the protection of the public, and as soon as the states began to act, there arose a great clamor for an exclusive national supervision of railroads. Let the public beware of any proposition that removes authority from the state to the nation. Every federal measure should be scrutinized to see that it does not limit or reduce the power of the state to control the corporations in so far as their operations are confined to the state. The very fact that the railroad managers prefer to trust the federal government is in itself suspicious. The people who have made so little progress in their fight for the control of railroads ought to be jealous of the rights of the states and carefully guard them from invasion.

REDUCE THE INTERSTATE RATE

The next congress will give the democrats a splendid chance to show their interest in railroad regulation. Several states have reduced the passenger rate to two cents per mile, and by the time congress meets, these state laws will be in effect, and the people living within those states will have the benefit of the two-cent rate when they purchase local tickets, but the railroads, while complying with the state law, are charging the three-cent rate on tickets which cover interstate transportation. For instance, Nebraska has a two-cent rate, and a person can travel at that rate from any point in Nebraska to any other point in Nebraska, but if he buys a ticket to any point outside of Nebraska, he has to pay the three-cent rate on the entire mileage. Those who understand the situation buy only to the state line and thus save one cent on each mile, but those who are not informed pay the three-cent rate without knowing it. Congress should pass a law at the next session requiring the railroads to sell interstate tickets at a rate not exceeding the sum of the rates through the states crossed. A very brief statute will cover the case, and the democrats should introduce such a bill on the first day of the session and urge its immediate con-

sideration. If the republican party dares to oppose it, let it take the responsibility for it. This is certainly one thing that can be done and done at once.

"INDESTRUCTIBLE"

Condemning Governor Glenn of North Carolina for his determined stand in defense of the laws of his state the St. Louis Globe-Democrat (republican) says: "Certain things took place a few decades ago which have made the American government an 'indestructible union of indestructible states,' and that verdict will not be overruled in Raleigh or any other state capital."

The Globe-Democrat would doubtless be very happy if, by a few waves of the bloody shirt, it could distract public attention from the evils of monopoly. "Indestructible union of indestructible states" describes our dual form of government. But a few months ago corporation newspapers were protesting against the exercise by the federal government of power over the corporations. Then, in their view, it was not such a thoroughly "indestructible union." But recently it has been demonstrated that the power of the states may be used in a practical and effective way for giving relief to the people and monopolists, with practically one voice, uphold the plea that power over corporations be centralized in the federal government. Whenever a federal judge seeks to annul the laws of the state in the interests of corporations and the authorities of the state enter protest the corporation organs have much to say of "indestructible union of indestructible states."

The bloody shirt will not serve in this day. The union is indeed indestructible but so is the state; and we must not forget that solemn constitutional warning: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution or prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the states respectively or to the people."

STEEL MAIL CARS

While the railway mail clerks do not feel free to urge important improvements in the service there seems to be unanimity in the desire for the adoption of the steel mail cars, and the desire is a reasonable one. Most of the collisions are head-end collisions and the railway mail clerk occupies a position of danger. Experience seems to have demonstrated that the steel car is safer than the car made of wood and it is perfectly natural that it should be preferred by these men who spend so much of their time upon the road. And why not provide the mail clerks with the best and safest cars that can be constructed? The amount paid the railroads for carrying mail in excess of what should be paid would soon replace all the wooden cars with steel cars, but the change will be delayed as long as the railroads can control the senate and house.

"AFTER THE ELECTION"

Will any anti-trust republican be deluded by the administration's assurance, given through Senator Hopkins of Illinois, that the tariff will be revised "after the presidential election?"

Will any one be deluded by the claim that the republican party may be depended upon to give the people relief on the trust question or on the tariff question, or on other questions in which it is to the interest of those who provide the republcan party with campaign funds to maintain present conditions?

Republican leaders cannot claim that the failure to provide relief was due to oversight. Democratic members of the house of representatives met in caucus on June 27, 1902, and adopted resolutions in which it was charged that the republican majority in congress "is dominated and controlled by the trusts and monopolies which have the great industries of our country in their grasp." These resolutions charged that the republican party refused and failed "to bring in any measure to

suppress the trusts or to favorably report any of the numerous anti-trust bills introduced by democratic members during this session." Then the democratic members resolved:

"We favor the immediate passage of a measure to amend the present anti-trust law, so as more fully to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and also a measure to reduce the duties on all articles and commodities manufactured and controlled or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, so as to destroy such illegal combinations, and to reduce the rate of duty on any article or commodity manufactured in the United States and sold in foreign country more cheaply than in the United States.

"We oppose the adjournment of congress until the measures mentioned above have been enacted into law."

The republican congress adjourned. The anti-trust law was not amended. Nothing was done to more fully protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; nothing was done to reduce the duties on articles and commodities manufactured and controlled or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, so as to destroy such illegal combinations; nothing was done to reduce the rate of duty on any article or commodity manufactured in the United States and sold in a foreign country more cheaply than in the United States.

The republican congress clearly showed that the arraignment made by the democratic caucus was justified. In the refusal of this congress to provide the people with any of the relief demanded, the republican congress provided proof, if, indeed, proof was necessary, that the republican party "is dominated and controlled by the trusts and monopolies which have the great industries of our country in their grasp."

JACKSON ON MONEY

An Oregon reader of The Commoner has a republican neighbor whose son is studying public questions. The young republican has been informed that Jackson's

views on the money question were applied with disastrous results by that great democrat. This is incorrect. Jackson opposed the national bank as it existed in his day for two reasons: First, because it violated the democratic doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none; and second, because the bank was attempting to control the politics of the country. Jackson's position was sound on both propositions. No one has stated more clearly than he the fundamental objections to a financial policy that bestows upon the banks the enormous privilege of issuing money. The head of the national bank attempted to intimidate by telling him that the bank could elect him or defeat him. Instead of being frightened into submission, he told Biddle, the bank's president, that if the bank had that power, it had more power than it ought to have and more than it would have long if he could prevent it. When an investigation was made, it was found that the bank had subsidized men in public life by loaning them money, and had subsidized the press. It was a great corrupting institution, and Jackson's high position in history is largely due to the fact that he had the courage to attack it and overthrow it.

Benton, in speaking of his work, compared him with Cicero, and said that in overthrowing the bank he had saved America as Cicero had saved Rome by overthrowing the conspiracy of Cataline. As Jackson's fame rests upon his successful attack upon intrenched privilege, so the abuse heaped upon him in his life and the calumnies circulated against him since his death have been due to the malice of those who, during his time and since, have represented predatory wealth.

SURPLUS

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat asks: "What will we do with the surplus in the national treasury, amounting to $87,000,000?" Well, when the republican party went into power March 4, 1889, there was a surplus of about $111,000,000—and they spent it.

There need be no worry about surplus under a republican administration. The g. o. p. will contrive to get rid of it.

NO DANGER OF PANIC

There is no danger of a panic. Those who are predicting it overlook the fact that the world's volume of money is increasing. Rising prices follow an increase in the currency and it is impossible to have a general panic when prices are rising. Of course, there will be readjustments in special cases where speculation raises prices above the normal level but we may expect a steady increase in the level of prices and a continuation of prosperity as long as the volume of money increases more rapidly than population and business.

The trouble is not with wealth production, but with distribution. The trusts are bleeding the public; the tariff barons are extorting from consumers and the railroads are overcharging patrons, but these things can be remedied now easier than ever before. The trusts can be dissolved and they will employ more people and sell more goods under competion; the tariff can be reduced and the wage roll and the output increased, railroad rates can be reduced and the patrons can use the money thus saved in buying what the manufacturers have to sell.

Now is the time to dissolve the trust, reform the tariff and reduce railroad rates, and no threat of panic should scare the public.

DO THEY FAVOR REGULATION?

For ten months the pro-railroad dailies have been endeavoring to make it appear that Mr. Bryan was forcing government ownership into the campaign. In his New York speech he said:

"I have already reached the conclusion that railroads partake so much of the nature of a monopoly that they must ultimately become public property and be man-

aged by public officials in the interest of the whole community in accordance with the well defined theory that public ownership is necessary where competition is impossible. I do not know that the country is ready for this change; I do not know that a majority of my own party favor it, but I believe that an increasing number of the members of all parties see in public ownership the only sure remedy for discrimination between persons and places and for extortionate rates for the carrying of freight and passengers.

"Believing, however, that the operation of all the railroads by the federal government would so centralize the government as to almost obliterate state lines, I prefer to see only the trunk lines operated by the federal government and the local lines by the several state governments. Some have opposed this dual ownership as impracticable, but investigation in Europe has convinced me that it is entirely practicable. Nearly all the railroads of Germany are owned by the several states, the empire not even owning trunk lines, and yet the interstate traffic is in no wise obstructed. In traveling from Constantinople to Vienna one passes through Turkey, Bulgaria, Servia, Hungary and a part of Austria without a change of cars. And yet, each country owns and operates its own roads and different languages are spoken on the different divisions of the lines. Sweden and Norway each owns its railroads, but they have no trouble about interstate traffic, although their political relations are somewhat strained. The ownership and operation of the local lines by the several state governments is not only feasible but it suits itself to the conditions existing in the various states. In those states where the people are ripe for a change the local lines can be purchased or new lines be built at once, while private ownership can continue in those states in which the people still prefer private ownership. Some states have been more careful than others to prevent the watering of stock and in the acquiring of roads each state can act according to the situation which it has to meet.

"As to the right of the governments, federal and state, to own and operate railroads there can be no doubt. If we can deepen the water in the lakes and build con-

necting canals in order to cheapen railroad transportation during half of the year, we can build a railroad and cheapen rates the whole year; if we can spend several hundred millions on the Panama canal to lower transcontinental rates, we can build a railroad from New York to San Francisco to lower both transcontinental and local rates. The United States mail is increasing so rapidly that we shall soon be able to pay the interest on the cost of trunk lines out of the money which we now pay to railroads for carrying through mails. If any of you question the propriety of my mentioning this subject I beg to remind you that the president could not have secured the passage of the rate bill had he not appealed to the fear of the more radical remedy of government ownership and nothing will so restrain the railroad magnates from attempting to capture the interstate commerce commission as the same fear. The high-handed manner in which they have violated law and ignored authority, together with the corruption discovered in high places, has done more to create sentiment in favor of public ownership than all the speeches and arguments of the opponents of private ownership."

Ten days later he said at Louisville, Kentucky:

"This statement of my views (Madison Square speech) has been assailed by some as an attempt to force these views upon the democratic party, and by some as an announcement of an intention to insist upon the incorporation of these views in the next democratic national platform.

"Let me answer these two charges. I have tried to make it clear that I expressed my own opinion and I have never sought to compel the acceptance of my opinion by any one else. Reserving the right to do my own thinking, I respect the right of every one else to do his thinking. I have too much respect for the right of others to ask them to accept any views that I may entertain unless those views commend themselves to others and I have too much confidence in the independent thought in my own party to expect that any considerable number of democrats would acknowledge my right

to do their thinking for them even if I were undemocratic enough to assert such a right.

"As to platforms, I have contended always that they should be made by the voters. I have, in my speeches and through my paper, insisted that the platform should be the expression of the wishes of the voters of the party and not be the arbitrary production of one man or a few leaders."

But in spite of his very plain language these papers have insisted upon misrepresenting his position and have persistently dodged the issue of regulation. Now that Mr. Bryan has pointed out that there is no disposition on the part of those who believe in government ownership to make it an issue in 1908 and that he does not believe it wise to inject the question into the campaign these papers insist that it is and must be an issue anyhow. But they will not be permitted to longer avoid the discussion of plans for effective regulation.

Do these editors believe in regulation or do they propose to leave the public helpless?

Here are three vital propositions connected with a present issue, namely, effective regulation:

First, the ascertaining of the value of all the railroads.

Second, the preventing of over-capitalization.

Third, the reduction of rates to a point where they will yield only a reasonable return upon the real value of the roads.

Let the railroad apologists meet these propositions. If the value of the roads should not be ascertained, why not? If watered stock should not be prevented, why not? If rates should not be reduced, why not? These papers have had lots of space for the discussion of government ownership, proposed as an ultimate solution. Will they now give a little space to the discussion of regulation—an immediate remedy?

A WORK OF ART

Mr. Bryan has received from the Amsterdam Democratic club of New York a handsomely embossed set of

resolutions and a certificate of election to honorary membership in the organization. As a work of art it possesses unusual merit, but more especially because of the kindly sentiments expressed in the resolutions will it be preserved and treasured by Mr. Bryan.

GOOD FOR LANDIS

Judge Kenesaw M. Landis is a conspicuous figure at this moment—conspicuous because, in a proceeding pending in his court, he had the courage to impose the extreme penalty against history's greatest pirate on the sea of commerce.

It is true that fines are not adequate to meet the situation for the reason that the criminals can often afford to pay the fines for the privilege of continuing the violation of law. Some have expressed the hope that Judge Landis would not impose the maximum fine because they feared the oil trust would merely increase the price to the consumers and make them pay the enormous fines even as they have been required to pay the "generous" contibutions made by Mr. Rockefeller to educational funds. But Judge Landis had nothing to do with that theory and it is well he imposed the maximum figure.

It is more than likely that the oil trust will shift the burden to the consumers, but this will only aid in the crystalization of that public sentiment that will be expressed so forcefully that men in authority will cease to trifle with the violations of anti-trust laws and will vigorously enforce that criminal law which provides for the imprisonment of the arrogant monopolist even as the common rogue is imprisoned.

Good for Landis. And now let us have—just as a beginning—a few prosecutions under the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law.

THE HAYWOOD TRIAL

Now that the trial of William D. Haywood is over, The Commoner can without impropriety comment on the case. In the last issue satisfaction was expressed at the verdict, but as the acquittal was announced just as we were going to press we could do no more than record the result.

The case deserves a place among the celebrated trials of the nation, and it is not too much to say that both sides were presented with consummate care and ability. The arguments made by Senator Borah for the state, and by Clarence Darrow for the defense, could scarcely be surpassed in force and eloquence; all was done that earnestness or talent could suggest to impress the evidence upon the jury and the judge's instructions were clear and to the point. That the jury should have so speedily acquitted was a triumph which even the defense could hardly expect. When the feeling existing in Idaho is considered—a feeling causing an unconscious bias for or against the miners in the minds of honest men—it would not have been surprising if the jury had disagreed. That the opinion among the jurors was almost unanimous on the first ballot makes the vindication more noteworthy.

It must be remembered that the state not only chose the place of trial, but kidnapped the defendants in another state, and hurried them to Idaho without opportunity to contest the extradition. While the United States supreme court held the kidnapping legal the decision cannot relieve the authorities of the charge of engaging in a conspiracy unworthy of state officials. But Haywood may well rejoice that he was kidnapped for the clandestine deportation adds completeness to his triumph.

But the verdict is more than a personal victory; it is a victory for the labor organization with which Haywood was connected. It would have seriously embarrassed the labor movement if wilful murder could have been traced to labor officials. The American people will not tolerate conspiracies to commit crime and all friends of labor have reason to rejoice that a jury of

disinterested men has rejected the evidence presented and declared the defendant not guilty. The trial, too, while removing the suspicion cast on Haywood by Orchard's confession, will be a warning to labor leaders to avoid association with those who, like Orchard, discredit the wage earners by suggesting violence as a remedy for their grievances.

The acquittal must also be regarded as a vindication of the jury system. Here were twelve disinterested men who bound themselves by oath to do justice between the state and the accused; for nearly three months they listened to witnesses, to lawyers and to the judge, and then retired to the jury room and, recognizing their responsibility, returned a concrete definition of justice which a nation approves. No such confidence could be reposed in a single judge as is reposed in a jury, and a judge might well shrink from the discharge of such a duty as the Haywood jury bravely performed.

A judge would have former or future trials to consider, and public opinion might have weight with him, but these men had only this case to think of and, after administering justice, they retire from public view. They could act with a freedom which no judge could feel and it is this very freedom to consider each case on its merits that furnishes one of the strongest arguments in favor of the jury system.

The friends of the defendant, the friends of labor and the friends of trial by jury can find cause for rejoicing in the acquittal of William D. Haywood.

PRAISING ROOSEVELT

Some of the democratic papers criticise Mr. Bryan for commending certain of the president's utterances and efforts, but these criticisms will not prevent an expression of appreciation of the educational work the chief executive is doing.

The president is entitled to commendation even from political opponents when he says or does anything good. One must be narrow minded indeed to refuse to do jus-

tice to an official merely because he belongs to another party. Then, too, one raises a suspicion as to his own sincerity if he loses interest in a righteous policy because some one else advocates it. But there is a good partisan reason why democrats should commend the president when he urges the adoption of democratic doctrine.

President Roosevelt advocates railroad regulation, trust prosecution, the income tax and arbitration of labor troubles. All of these were demanded by democratic platforms when republican platforms were silent on the subject. It required some courage on the part of a republican president to repudiate his own platform and borrow from the platforms of his opponents and he is entitled to credit for it. Some of the so-called democratic papers refuse to say a good word for the president because these papers do not believe in railroad regulation, trust prosecution, the income tax and arbitration, but nearly all democrats do, and by commending the president on these subjects they help to convince republicans that democratic ideas have virtue in them.

What democratic speaker has converted as many republicans to democracy as the president has? If the democrats abandoned democratic reforms merely because the president endorsed them they would simply turn over the democratic platform to the opposition. The president has made it impossible for republicans to oppose the democratic party on railroad regulation, trust prosecution, income tax and arbitration, and it would be ungenerous to refuse to recognize the great service he has rendered.

But in commending the president when he is democratic, Mr. Bryan does not overlook the bad things said and done. His military spirit, his desire for a large navy, his leanings toward centralization, his silence on tariff reform, his refusal to urge the direct election of senators, and his failure to make railroad regulation and trust prosecution effective—all these have been criticized.

Peter Cartright was once asked if he was sanctified and he replied, "yes, in spots." The president is demo-

cratic in spots and, while the spots are not large enough or numerous enough, democrats are justified in calling attention to the spots and admiring them. The popularity which the president has won has been won by his democratic spots and this popularity ought to be a lesson to both democrats and republicans. It ought to convince democrats of the folly of running away from radical democracy, and it ought to teach thousands of young republicans the wisdom of taking the people's side on public questions.

A BILLION DOLLAR ASSET

During the month of August, 1902, the Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald (republican) sent to his newspaper this dispatch:

"It was not a democratic campaigner, but a western republican who said to your correspondent: 'I see President Schwab of the steel trust has made public an estimate of the value of the various assets of that great corporation, $700,000,000 for ore mines, $300,000,000 for steel plants, $200,000,000 for transportation facilities, etc. But I am surprised that Mr. Schwab with his keen business acumen, should fail to include one of the most valuable of all the assets of the United States steel corporation. This is a device which shuts out all foreign competition. It is a scheme which compels foreign manufacturers of steel and iron who want to sell goods in the American market to stand a handicap of 40 per cent before they can do so. How much this asset is worth to the steel trust it would be very difficult for an outsider to estimate, and for that reason I should like to see President Schwab's figures. I venture the assertion that he would not rate it a penny less than $1,000,000,000. Probably the fact that this asset is on the federal statute books under the name of the Dingley law led Mr. Schwab to leave it out of his long, imposing list of property and resources of his corporation.' "

What party provided this trust with this valuable

asset, an asset that Mr. Schwab would probably not rate a penny less than one billion dollars? The republican party.

What has the republican party received in return for the maintenance of this valuable asset? Generous campaign contributions.

If this valuable asset is worth not a penny less than $1,000,000,000, from whose pockets does this immense sum come? From the pockets of the people.

This Record-Herald dispatch attracted, at the time, general attention; there was then in the republican party considerable tariff revision sentiment. Nearly five years have elapsed, but in the meantime nothing has been done to interfere with the steel trust's Billion Dollar Asset, alias The Dingley Bill.

Why should a statesman like Senator Hopkins have the effrontry to promise revision "after the presidential election?" Why should newspaper editors who know the hollowness of that promise parade it, as worthy of consideration, before their oft deluded readers?

Why should the American people give their votes to a party that would provide so valuable an asset as tariff shelter to a handful of men and at the expense of the people?

TARIFF CATECHISM

Q. What is a tariff?

A. A duty collected on imports.

Q. What is a protective tariff?

A. A duty imposed upon imports for the aid of home factories producing competing articles.

Q. What is a revenue tariff?

A. A revenue tariff is a tariff levied for the purpose of raising a revenue.

Q. What is the difference between the two kinds of tariff?

A. A revenue tariff is collected for the benefit of the whole public, and the government stops when it gets

enough. A protective tariff is imposed for private benefit, may be so levied as to impose a heavy burden without raising much revenue and there is no limit to its exactions except the greed of the protected interests and the patience of the people.

Q. Who pays the tariff?

A. The consumer.

Q. How can this fact be established?

A. By reason, by observation and by experience. If a tariff were paid by the foreigner it would be no protection to the home industry. Only when the consumer must pay more than the foreign price for an imported article can the home producer charge more than the foreign price for the domestic article. A tariff paid by the foreigner would give no protection to an American manufacturer. Then, too, the goverment gives a rebate on raw material when the finished product is exported. Why does the government pay the rebate to the domestic manufacturer if the foreigner pays the tariff? But experience is the best test. Go abroad, buy in the open market, and when you return you will pay the duty and you cannot find any foreigner to reimburse you.

Q. Is such a tax constitutional?

A. It violates the spirit of the constitution for it collects from the many and gives to the few, but as the protective features are concealed in a revenue law it is difficult to get a decision on the principle involved.

Q. Can the wisdom of such a tax be defended?

A. No; a policy of favoritism is never wise in a republic. A government of the people, by the people and for the people should be administered according to the maxim: Equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Q. Is the present protective tariff necessary?

A. No; it is about twice as high as would be necessary to cover the entire labor cost of protected manufactures. The fact that we are exporting an increasing amount of manufactures is proof that our industries do not need the present protection. And it must be

remembered that our manufactures have the benefit of the freight when the foreigner brings his goods here, while the foreign competitor has the benefit of the freight when we export. And it must also be remembered that the tariff on all kinds of material, on machinery and on food and clothing increases the cost of articles manufactured here. If we can now export in spite of these burdens we could export more if the tariff were reduced.

Q. Does a high tariff make good wages?

A. No. It is said that we pay higher wages than they do in England—a stock argument with protectionists—it is a complete answer to say that England with no protective tariff pays better wages than Germany does under protection. Our best wages are paid in our unprotected industries and the fact that we export goods made with our high priced labor is positive proof that good wages do not depend on protection. The labor organizations have done far more to increase wages than all the tariff laws.

Q. What about the home market argument?

A. The friends of protection claim that the farmer can afford to pay more when he buys because the manufacturers furnish him a home market, but this is a fallacy. The staples of the farm are exported and the price received for the surplus exported fixes the price received for the part sold at home. As the farmer sells in the unprotected markets of the world and buys in a protected market he is constantly drained of his earnings for the benefit of the manufacturer and the manufacturer now shows his ingratitude by selling abroad cheaper than at home.

Q. How has the tariff been maintained so long when it is wrong in principle, unwise in policy and unnecessary?

A. The protected interests have contributed liberally to support literary bureaus and to campaign funds and have coerced their employes by the threat of shutting down. Advocates of protection have been able to organize, distribute literature and get out the vote, while advocates of tariff reform, as they could promise no

special pecuniary benefits, have had to make their campaigns without funds. The advocates of protection have done much to corrupt public opinion by boldly teaching that the voter should use the ballot to advance his pecuniary interests. The manufacturer has been invited to vote dividends into his pocket, the wool grower has been solicited to vote himself a higher price for wool and the laboring man has been warned that a vote against protection would lower his wages.

Q. Is it true as often asserted by advocates of a high tariff that a high tariff always brings good times and that tariff reform always brings a panic?

A. No. Prosperity followed the low tariff of 1846 and the panic of 1873 occurred under a high tariff. The panic of 1873 not only occurred under a high tariff but twelve years after the republican party came into power and eleven years before Mr. Cleveland's first election. The panic of 1893 occurred while the McKinley law was in force—a year before the Wilson bill was passed, and really began while the republican party was in power.

Q. Is there any evidence of growth in tariff reform sentiment?

A. Yes. The farmers are no longer deceived by the home market argument, the employes no longer regard their wages as dependent upon the tariff and many manufacturers find the tariff more of an embarrassment than a benefit. Our exporters, too, are discovering that our tariff discriminations excite retaliation in other countries.

Q. When will the beneficiaries of protection consent to tariff reduction?

A. Never. A child gets so old that it is ashamed to nurse; a calf gets so big that it will wean itself, but no beneficiary of protection ever voluntarily lets go of the public teat.

Q. When will the tariff be reformed by its friends?

A. Just after the money lenders ask for a reduction in the legal rate of interest—that is, just before the millenium.

Q. To whom must we look for tariff reform?

A. To those who suffer—no abuse was ever reformed by those who profited by the abuse to be reformed.

Q. When should tariff reform begin?

A. At once.

Q. And how?

A. By putting on the free list those articles which compete with articles controlled by the trusts; second, by the reduction of the tariff on the necessaries of life, and, third, by such other changes in the tariff schedules as will put "protection for protection's sake" "in the process of ultimate extinction" with a view to restoring the tariff to a revenue basis.

ALWAYS "MANANA"

A newspaper dispatch from Washington under date of August 10, 1902, said: "It is also promised that there will be some tariff revision after the November elections."

Commenting upon this promise The Commoner said at the time: "It is significant that every hope held out by republican leaders depends upon what the party will do 'after the election.'"

Since then there have been three congressional elections and one presidential election and now the tariff revisionists within the republican party are expected to accept without question the promise that the republican party will revise the tariff "after the presidential election of 1908."

IMMUNE

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat says: "Oklahoma's new constitution contains upward of 50,000 words. Suspicion naturally points to Colonel Bryan."

Oklahoma's new constitution also shows a determination to bring the government closer to the people and

to destroy the political influence of the special interests that prey upon the people. Suspicion does not, however, point to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

HELP OKLAHOMA

The Oklahoma election will take place September 17. It is plain that in the pending Oklahoma campaign the democratic party stands for the people while the republican party represents the special interests.

The Commoner invites the attention of the democrats of the nation to the fact that the Oklahoma democracy is in need of financial assistance. Oklahoma democrats have many obstacles to overcome. They have arrayed against them the powerful influence of all the public service corporations of the state and the national administration, with every federal official in the vicinity actively engaged in the effort to bring about a republican victory. Then the republican party has all the money it can conveniently use.

Oklahoma democrats feel that they will win, but they will leave no stone unturned. They are entitled to some substantial assistance from the democrats of the nation. If every democrat who reads this article will contribute a small sum Oklahoma democrats will have ample funds with which to pay the legitimate expenses of their campaign.

Such contributions may be sent to Ed. O. Cassidy, chairman of the Oklahoma state democratic executive committee, care Lee Hotel, Oklahoma City, Okla.

RAISING A FALSE ISSUE

Error always employs deception. Nothing is more fatal to a false doctrine than to have it clearly stated and the defenders of a false doctrine admit this when they studiously misstate the issue. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat furnishes an illustration of this. In an edi-

torial entitled "The New Irrepressible Conflict" the Globe-Democrat takes Governor Glenn, Governor Comer and Governor Swanson to task for prosecuting the railroads and declares that these governors are assisting the doctrines that led to civil war. The charge is not true and the Globe-Democrat confesses the weakness of its position when it attempts to present a false issue. Neither Governor Glenn, Governor Swanson nor Governor Comer has disputed the supremacy of the federal government in the regulation of inter-state commerce. The question involved in North Carolina and Virginia is, have these states the right to regulate commerce wholly within their borders?

A federal judge undertook, at the request of the railroads, to suspend the state rate law and to release persons arrested for violation of that law. The law had never been decided unconstitutional or confiscatory, but the judge ASSUMED that the exparte statement of the railroads was correct and proceeded to restrain the states. The governors decided to test the question, and the roads finally decided to do what they ought to have done in the first place, namely, comply with the law while they contested its validity through the regular channels.

Governor Comer of Alabama is testing another question, and this is the question which most disturbs the Globe-Democrat, namely, whether a state can forbid a corporation to transfer a case to the federal courts when suit is brought against it. The Alabama legislature enacted a law forbidding the removal and providing for the revocation of license as a penalty. The Southern railroad violated the law and the road's license to do business in the state was revoked. Governor Comer is enforcing the law, and why should he not enforce the law? He swore to enforce the law when he took the oath of office, but probably the Globe-Democrat would have him read into such oath "except where the law concerns a railroad."

If a state creates a corporation can it not fix the terms on which it can do business? And if a state permits a foreign corporation to do business within its borders can it not prescribe the terms and compel compli-

ance with those terms? And what requirement is more reasonable than that the corporation shall submit its controversies to the courts of the state? The state courts are less expensive and nearer to the litigants. A state acts not only within its rights but according to its duty when it protects its citizens from the vexation of litigation in federal courts.

The Globe-Democrat does not dare to state the issue as it is for then it would have to admit its sympathy with the corporations as against the people. To conceal its bias in favor of corporate aggression it refers to the war and appeals to prejudice. But its attempts will fail. Every state ought to have a law like that which Governor Comer is enforcing and every state ought to have a governor like Governor Comer. The republican readers of the Globe-Democrat in Illinois and Missouri are just as much interested as the democrats in securing protection from the delays, inconveniences and costs of the federal courts.

All of these controversies are hastening the day when the rights of corporations will be defined and their powers properly limited. There has been a confusing of the rights of the man-made corporation with the rights of the God-made man. The corporation has only conferred rights while man has natural and inalienable rights. It is time to protect the God-made man from the man-made giant.

SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW NOT AMENDED

The Houston (Texas) Post, referring to the prosecution of the Standard Oil trust resulting in the $29,240,000 fine, refers to "the Elkins law of 1903, which amended the Sherman anti-trust law of 1890 and repealed the imprisonment provisions of the interstate commerce law." The Elkins law did amend the anti-rebate law by doing away with the imprisonment feature. It did not, however, amend or relate in any degree to the Sherman anti-trust law of 1890. The Sherman anti-trust law has never been amended.

The Commoner refers to this fact because it has been

noticed from communications received in this office that there is a widespread impression that the Elkins law, which did away with the imprisonment feature, abolished the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law. Democratic newspapers everywhere ought to impress upon their readers the fact that the Sherman anti-trust law remains upon the statute books just as it was enacted, just as it has been sustained by the United States supreme court—and it should be emphasized, too, that the criminal clause of that great law remains unenforced by the republican administration.

The only effort to enforce this clause was in the beef trust cases and then when the beef trust magnates were at the very threshold of the penitentiary it developed that some one in authority had taken the precaution to give them an "immunity bath."

THE GREATEST MAN

William C. Channing paid a high tribute to the common people when he said: "The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution; who resists the sorest temptations from within and without; who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully; who is calmest in storms and most fearless under menace and frowns; whose reliance on truth, on virtue, on God, is most unfaltering. I believe this greatness to be most common among the multitude, whose names are never heard."

THE TARIFF IN 1896 AND 1900

A Commoner reader directs attention to the fact that the New York World charges that the democratic platforms in 1896 and 1900 dodged the tariff question. The World has often made this charge although its error has, as often, been pointed out.

The Chicago platform said: "We hold that tariff duties should be levied for the purpose of revenue, such

duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between classes or sections, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the government, honestly and economically administered." The Chicago platform denounced the proposition of the republicans to restore the McKinley law, and declared that that law "enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade and deprived the producers of the great American staples, of access to their natural markets."

Not only did the platform of 1900 "condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they did not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear," but it also declared that "tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free lists to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection."

The Kansas City platform further said: "We reaffirm and indorse the principles of the national democratic platform, adopted at Chicago in 1896."

While it is true that in 1896, as in 1900, the tariff question was not a conspicuous issue, and while the Chicago platform objected to "any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in the revenue caused by the adverse decision of the supreme court on the income tax," the party did not abandon its time-honored position on the tariff question in either 1896 or in 1900. Nor were these platforms evasive upon the tariff question. It is absurd to say that the democratic position was evasive in 1900 with a platform that denounced the Dingley law, promised the amendment of the tariff laws by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection and reaffirmed the platform of 1896 in which platform it was plainly said: "We hold that tariff duties should be levied for the purposes of revenue."

"ULTIMATELY"

Referring to Mr. Taft's spech at Columbus the Milwaukee Sentinel says: "His pointed declaration against government ownership of railroads should apprise Mr. Bryan of the futility of his own recent efforts to discard that issue and keep it out of the coming campaign should he be nominated."

But in that same speech Mr. Taft himself said that if a remedy is not provided for present day evils "then we may certainly expect that the movement toward government ownership will become a formidable one that cannot be stayed."

PRESIDENT URGES CENTRALIZATION

The president has at last disclosed his scheme for centralization at which he has hinted in former speeches. In his Provincetown, Mass., address, he proposes the national incorporation of railroads and other corporations engaged in interstate commerce. He says:

"Most large corporations do a business that is not confined to any one state. Experience has shown that the effort to control these corporations by mere state action cannot produce wholesome results. In most cases such effort fails to correct the real abuses of which the corporation is or may be guilty; while in other cases the effort is apt to cause either hardship to the corporation itself, or else hardship to neighboring states which have not tried to grapple with the problem in the same manner; and, of course, we must be as scrupulous to safeguard the rights of the corporations as to exact from them in return a full measure of justice to the public.

"I believe in a national incorporation law for corporations engaged in interstate business. I believe, furthermore, that the need for action is most pressing as regards those corporations which, because they are common carriers, exercise a quasi public function; and which can be completely controlled, in all respects, by the federal government, by the exercise of the power con-

ferred under the interstate commerce clause, and, if necessary, under the post-road clause of the constitution.

"During the last few years we have taken marked strides in advance along the road of proper regulation of these railroad corporations, but we must not stop in the work. The national government should exercise over them a similar supervision and control to that which it exercises over national banks. We can do this only by proceeding farther along the lines marked out by the recent national legislation."

Here is the secret—it is out at last! The states are annoying the corporations and the corporations demand federal protection from state legislation. The president thinks that action "is most pressing as regards those corporations which, because they are common carriers, exercise a quasi public function." The states have been enacting two-cent fare laws and laws reducing freight rates and the railroad managers demand that they shall be relieved from further fear of such legislation. The president's Hamiltonian ideas make him an easy victim and he yields to the entreaties of the railroads.

If it was the public he sought to protect he would recommend federal remedies which would not interfere with state remedies—but it is the railroad, not the public, that demands the removal of authority to Washington.

The democrats can be depended upon to oppose with all their might this movement toward centralization. If any democrat wavers his constituents should look into his business relations and see whether he is under obligations to the railroads. A Hamiltonian republican, like the president, may honestly think that the further the government is removed from the people the better it will be, but a Jeffersonian democrat does not cherish any such delusion. Even the Hamiltonian republican ought to hesitate to trust congress with any more power while the United States senators are elected by legislatures.

It is fortunate that the people have had an object lesson so recently. The federal law stopped rebates and passes, but the railroads make more money than they

did before. The states, on the other hand, gave the people a reduction in rates and those who are receiving the benefit of these reductions will be slow to surrender the advantage thus far gained.

It is very doubtful whether the republican congressmen from the west will dare to support the president's proposition, but if an attempt is made to put such a measure through congress the democrats will stand a good chance of retiring every western republican who votes for it. Let the democrats present an unbroken front on this vital proposition.

TAFT WEAKENS ON REFORM

Secretary Taft's speech will prove a disappointment to those who expected a clear bugle note in favor of reform. There is not a single question on which he takes a strong, advanced position.

On the railroad question he is in favor of preventing watered stock, opposes the consolidation of competing lines and the duplication of directorates. So far so good; but he does not advocate the ascertaining of the value of the roads or the reduction of rates. He even defends the president from the charge of favoring the reductions made by the states. The railroads may object to his rhetorical denunciation of abuses, but they will hardly be scared by his remedies.

On the trust question he thunders at UNLAWFUL trusts, but not only does not recommend new legislation but takes the position that a monopoly may not be harmful. He seems to lean toward the idea that it must be convicted of some harmful act—and this throws the burden of proof upon the government. He recognizes that "restraint is more difficult" when one corporation swallows up a lot of other corporations—that "it involves enormous labor on the part of the government to prosecute such a combination because the proof of the gist of the offense lies underneath an almost limitless variety of transactions," and yet he is opposed to the license system which would enable the government to

absolutely prevent a monopoly. In other words, he gives the benefit of the doubt to the corporation instead of to the people. He thinks that putting one or two trust magnates in the penitentiary would have a healthy effect, but he uses so many qualifying words that one is left in doubt as to what he really favors.

After submitting an argument in support of an inheritance tax and a graduated income tax, he concludes by saying that he is not in favor of adopting either of them NOW. At some future time he may favor them IF THEY ARE NEEDED.

He comes out strong in favor of government by injunction, but does not take any position on arbitration and election of senators by the people.

He takes a rap at socialism, denounces the initiative and referendum and presents an argument against government ownership of railroads. He is stronger in stating what he opposes than in stating what he favors and he—unintentionally, of course—misstates Mr. Bryan's position on several questions.

He makes out a strong case in favor of tariff reform, but when he gets to the remedy he goes no further than the republican leaders have gone in former campaigns. He wants enough tariff to cover the difference in cost of labor here and abroad—the excuse given for the present tariff—and he wants the tariff reformed by its friends. "Tariff reform by the friends of the tariff" is a farce and a fraud and the secretary runs away from the conclusions which would naturally be drawn from the statistics which he presents.

The conservatives may object to his speech because it admits many democratic contentions, but no real reformer will find encouragement in it. It is a straddle of the most important issues—a compromise instead of fight for reform.

SO DEMOCRATS CHARGED

In his speech at Columbus Mr. Taft admitted what democrats have all along asserted, namely, that the Elkins law was favored by the railroads because it re-

pealed the imprisonment clause of the interstate commerce law.

On this point Mr. Taft said: "Under the 1889 amendmend, however, the individuals convicted could have been sent to the penitentiary, whereas under the Elkins act, the punishment by imprisonment was taken away while the fine was increased. The chief effect the Elkins law had on these particular prosecutions, which have been given so much prominence, was to make it easier to convict the corporation and to increase its fine, but to save the guilty individual perpetrators from imprisonment. It is well understood that the Elkins bill was passed without opposition by, and with the full consent of, the railroads, and that the chief reason for this was the elimination of the penitentiary penalty for unjust discriminations."

Democrats will do well to keep this extract from Mr. Taft's address conveniently at hand for the information of their republican friends.

TAFT ON GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

Secretary Taft gives three reasons for opposing government ownership, namely:

"First—Because existing government railways are not managed with either the efficiency or economy of privately managed roads and the rates charged are not as low and therefore not as beneficial to the public.

"Second—Because it would involve an expenditure of certainly $12,000,000,000 to acquire the interstate railways and the creation of an enormous national debt.

"Third—Because it would place in the hands of a reckless executive a power of control over business and politics that the imagination can hardly conceive, and would expose our popular institutions to danger."

The first proposition is not sound. In the countries which have both systems the government roads are preferred by the people, as shown by the fact that government roads are being extended. It is not fair to compare government roads ABROAD with private roads

HERE because conditions are different. If he will compare municipal water and lighting plants in this country with plants owned by private corporations he will find that plants owned by the municipalities are managed with more efficiency and economy and charge lower rates.

Mr. Taft's second objection is that government ownership would involve an enormous debt. It is sufficient to say that a government debt bears a lower rate of interest than railroad bonds and that, as the people now pay interest on the railroad bonds (through railroad rates) their burdens would be actually decreased by government ownership. The saving would be even more than the lower interest would indicate because the people are now paying on an inflated capitalization. The secretary conveniently overlooks the fact that the adoption of the system would be gradual and that the people would be guided by experience as they proceeded.

As for the third objection it is only necessary to compare the mail service in the hands of the government with the railway service in private hands. In 1896 there was a great deal more coercion practiced on the railway employes than on the railway mail clerks, and even this might be lessened by improvements in the civil service. Then, too, under a dual ownership it would be impossible for a national administration to make a political use of the roads owned by the several states.

But Secretary Taft's discussion of government ownership was immaterial, first, because it is not a present issue, and second, because he admits that if the remedy for present evils is not radical "THEN WE MAY CERTAINLY EXPECT THAT THE MOVEMENT TOWARD GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP WILL BECOME A FORMIDABLE ONE THAT CANNOT BE STAYED." In other words, the evils of government ownership, even as he magnifies them, will be preferable to present abuses. The railroads, he declares, "have been weighed in the balance and found wanting."

The secretary's remarks on this subject, while displaying considerable ignorance, will serve at least one

useful purpose, namely, they will impress republicans with the necessity of favoring even more radical regulation than Mr. Taft suggests.

TRUSTING THE INDIVIDUAL

Secretary Taft undertakes to draw a contrast between President Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan, saying that the former trusts the individual while the latter distrusts him. Mr. Taft may be able to speak for the president, but he shows gross ignorance of Mr. Bryan's position. Mr. Bryan, like all other democrats, trusts the individual—that is a distinguishing feature of the democrat, but the Jeffersonian democrat recognizes the weaknesses of man as well as the rights of man and the weakness of man shows itself when the representative puts his own interest above the interests of his constituents.

Jefferson declared that confidence was the parent of despotism and that free government existed in jealousy —not in confidence. The Hamiltonian republican trusts the representative but not the individual. The Hamiltonian republican thinks that a representative is elected to think for the people; the Jeffersonian democrat believes that the people should think for themselves and then elect representatives to act for them and give expression to their thoughts.

Mr. Bryan takes the Jeffersonian view and has expressed his views so often that Secretary Taft ought not to be ignorant of them. Because Mr. Bryan believes in and trusts the individual he favors the election of senators by direct vote and he also favors such checks on our representative system as will enable the individuals to control their representatives and prevent betrayal. It is Secretary Taft who, following in the footsteps of Hamilton, distrusts the individual and puts his faith in the representative. Secretary Taft has raised a question which will embarrass him—it will not embarrass Mr. Bryan.

"MANANA"

The Spanish have a word, "manana" which means "tomorrow." Secretary Taft may yet become famous as "the manana statesman." He seems to favor putting everything off until tomorrow. He is in favor of an income tax—but not just now; he believes in an inheritance tax—but not for the present; he thinks the Filipinos will be ready for self government after awhile; and he feels that tariff reform might be a good thing —after the next election, or some other time in the future. How would it do for reformers to adopt his own language and say "Secretary Taft might make a good president—some day, but not yet, afterwhile, say about 1912 or 1916." Present abuses need immediate treatment and "manana" is not likely to become a popular campaign slogan.

MISREPRESENTING MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP

In this issue The Commoner reproduces from the Richmond (Va.) Evening Journal an unusually interesting parallel column showing.

In one column appears a Wheeling, W. Va., dispatch to the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch setting forth at length the alleged failure of municipal ownership of the water plant at the town of Martins Ferry, Ohio.

In the other column is the clear and explicit statement made by James M. Blackford, mayor of Martins Ferry.

An immense literary bureau has been organized for the purpose of beating down the rapidly growing sentiment in favor of municipal ownership of public utilities, and it is plain that this literary bureau does not hesitate to misrepresent. It will be remembered that not long ago a statement purporting to come from Lincoln, Neb., was printed in various publications and in this statement it was claimed that Lincoln had failed in its attempt at municipal ownership of the water plant. Mayor Brown, of Lincoln, issued a statement which will doubt-

less be remembered by Commoner readers. He pointed out the great advantages derived by the public through Lincoln's ownership of its water plant.

Newspaper editors should exercise greater care in the publication of such material. The literary bureaus of the special interests would be impotent if every newspaper in the land adhered to the motto of the old Salem Register, and if editors were as careful in scrutinizing the "copy" furnished by the literary bureaus of a lawless element as they are in the examination of communications offered them by the "Pro Bono Publico" of their immediate neighborhood.

THE LINEUP

The trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question present the same issue between the general public and the privileged classes. Shall the government be administered in the interest of the whole people or in the interest of a few? This is the issue presented by the trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question.

While democrats may differ as to the relative importance of the trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question, all must agree that the party must take the side of the common people on all three questions.

Let the line be drawn between those who want to make this a government of the people, by the people and for the people and those who want it to be a government of the corporations, by the corporations and for the corporations.

THE TURN IN THE LANE

"It is a long lane that has no turn," says the proverb. It looked for years as if the Standard Oil company was an exception to the rule; it violated every law, human and divine; it bankrupted rivals and impoverished producers; it extorted from the public; it coerced railroads

into violations of state and federal statutes; it overawed courts and subsidized the churches, the colleges and the press. But the turn has come at last, and it is a short, sharp turn, too. Judge Landis gives the company the full limit of the law and expresses regret that imprisonment cannot be added. The fine of $29,240,000 is nearly thirty times the capital stock of the subordinate corporation through which the Standard acted, and is about equal to eight months' dividends of the big company. But the moral influence of the fine is still more important; other judges will take notice and the judge who shows leniency will have to explain why. It is the beginning of the end. The giant conspirator against law and morals has been brought to bay and the people breathe a sigh of relief. Judge Landis has earned a nation's gratitude.

Just as the fine is imposed the head of the bureau of corporations files a report denying in detail the arguments presented in defense of the Standard Oil's monopoly. It is shown that it has raised prices instead of lowering them and that it has prevented the people from getting the full benefit of improved processes of manufacture. Stripped of the deceptive arguments which it has spread broadcast it stands forth convicted of about every crime in the catalogue.

And the man whose cunning planned it all—what a pitiful figure! The lesson his life teaches will not be lost on the country.

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

PROVE IT NOW

In an editorial in a recent issue Leslie's Weekly says: "Suppose?—Tariff revision should be made the leading issue in the democratic platform in the presidential campaign next year? Suppose the necessaries of life at the time should contine to remain on the present high and unnatural plane, and that it should be charged that our industries sell their products at lower prices abroad

than at home, and that the reports of Corporation Commissioner Smith on the Standard Oil company prove the charge? Suppose a severe business recession should leave many persons without employment in the presidential year? Suppose democratic newspapers and orators should charge the high prices and the business recession to the protective tariff, repeat the stale falsehood that 'the tariff is the mother of all trusts,' and make that the burning question of the campaign? Suppose republican trust 'busters,' who are magnifying the trust issue and imperiling the national prosperity—on the achievement of which the party's success has been and must be won—should attempt to deny these fallacies and falsehoods? Would they have time to do it satisfactorily, in the present inflamed temper of an inconsiderate and thoughtless people, before the close of the polls on November 3, 1908? If not, what would happen, and to whom?''

Well, we know one thing that would happen to Leslie's Weekly. Unless it secured a new corps of writers it would be unable to make its regular appearance after it had been announced that the system for which Leslie's Weekly has so long been a servile spokesman had met defeat at the polls.

But why not take time by the forelock? The tariff question is being discussed right now. Why not begin the work of proving that the tariff is not the mother of any trust; that the foreigner pays the tax; that a high protective tariff is the ''best expression of pure and patriotic statesmanship?'' Why not undertake to show that there is no relation between the fact that the republican party gets its campaign funds from the tariff barons and the fact that the republican congress fails to heed the demand made from the rank and file of its party that the tariff be revised for the benefit of the people? Why not prove that republican leaders are serious when they insist that ''the tariff should be revised by its friends?'' The republican congress will meet in December next. Why not revise the tariff then —say just enough of a revision to show that the repub-

lican leaders are sufficiently free from the chains binding them to "the system" to open the subject for debate upon the floors of congress.

SILENT ON THE TARIFF

A newspaper writer complains "one may search the speech of Mr. Roosevelt at Provincetown with a microscope and yet find nothing bearing upon the tariff issue."

Ultra-protectionists have never felt that they could at all times depend upon Mr. Roosevelt. They know what many people have forgotten, that at one time—and not so very many years ago, either—Mr. Roosevelt was one of the conspicuous members of the New York Free Trade league. When he resigned from membership in that body he wrote that he was "a republican first and a free trader afterward." Some of the ultra-protectionists doubtless suspect that Mr. Roosevelt felt very much at home in the position taken through Secretary Taft's free trade order issued in 1905. They remember that when Mr. Roosevelt wrote the "Life of Thomas H. Benton," he had something to say concerning protection. On pages 66 and 67 of that book will be found the following: "The vote on the protective tariff law of 1828 furnishes another illustration of the solidarity of the west. New England had abandoned her free trade position since 1824 and the north went strongly for the new tariff; the southern sea-coast states, except Louisiana, opposed it bitterly; and the bill was carried by the support of the western states, both the free and the slave. This tariff bill was the first of the immediate irritating causes which induced South Carolina to go into the nullification movement. Benton's attitude on the measure was that of a good many other men who, in their public capacity, are obliged to appear as protectionists, but who lack his frankness in stating their reasons. He utterly disbelieved in and was opposed to the principles of the bill, but as it had bid for and secured the interest of Missouri by a heavy duty on lead, he felt himself forced to support it; and he so

announced his position. He simply went with his state precisely as did Webster. The latter in following Massachusetts' change of front and supporting the tariff of 1828, turned a full and complete somersault. Neither the one nor the other was to blame. Free traders are apt to look at the tariff from a sentimental standpoint, but it is in reality purely a business matter, and should be decided solely on the grounds of expediency. Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice; but if the majority of the people interested wish it, and it affects only themselves, there is no earthly reason why they should not be allowed to try the experiment to their heart's content. The trouble is that it rarely does affect only themselves; and in 1828, the evil was peculiarly aggravating on account of the unequal way in which the proposed law would affect different sections. It purported to benefit the rest of the country, but it undoubtedly worked real injury to the planter states and there is small ground for wonder that the irritation over it in the region so affected should have been intense."

Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt has never changed his views on this subject. His position may have been like "that of a good many other men who, in their public capacity, are obliged to appear as protectionists." Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt has all along believed with the political economists who, according to Mr. Roosevelt himself, have "pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice."

IN OKLAHOMA

Next Tuesday will be held the first election in the new state of Oklahoma. The democrats of the new state offer a ticket made up of splendid men who are standing upon a platform that means something for the people. The republicans are opposing the adoption of the new state constitution, the only objection to it being that it confers too many powers upon the people themselves and restricts the opportunities of trusts and corpora-

tions to exploit the people. Secretary Taft opposed its adoption, one ground being that it conferred the right of trial by jury in all cases of contempt arising from the violation of injunctions. Naturally enough the corporations, and especially the transportation companies, oppose the constitution because of this provison, and because of the further provision that it confers upon the people the right to protect themselves against the encroachments of the corporations. The republican leaders are opposing the adoption of the constitution because its adoption means an end to the territorial government which has afforded them such rich political picking. The democrats have taken the people into their confidence and have waged an open fight based upon the plain statement of democratic principles, and they are confident of success.

MR. BRYAN IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. Bryan delivered several speeches in the Oklahoma campaign which campaign terminates Tuesday, September 17, when the election will take place. On the first day he spoke at Vinita, Tulsa, and Sepulpa, Indian Territory; at Bristow, Chandler and Oklahoma City, Okla. On the second day he spoke at Woodward and Alva, Oklahoma.

Concerning Mr. Bryan's speech at Oklahoma City the Associated Press said:

"Ten thousand persons heard William J. Bryan here tonight reply to the recent address of Secretary of War Taft upon the Olkahoma-Indian Territory political situation, in convention hall, and 3,000 persons, unable to secure admittance to the auditorium, attended an overflow meeting nearby. Mr. Bryan was enthusiastically received."

An abstract of Mr. Bryan's speech at Oklahoma City follows:

Secretary Taft, in his speech made in this territory a few days ago, advises the people to reject the proposed constitution and postpone statehood until another ena-

bling act can be secured. At first blush one might suspect that the secretary's advice was due to his personal interest in the next election. He might be accused of advising the postponement of statehood with a view to keeping seven electoral votes out of the democratic column, but the more generous view taken in the matter is that his advice resulted from his habits of thought. He is inclined to postpone everything. He promises to acquire the tile of The Great Postponer. In a speech made not long ago at Columbus, Ohio, he announced himself as in favor of tariff reform, but he would postpone it until after the next election. He also made an elaborate argument in favor of the income tax, but he would postpone it indefinitely. He agreed with the president in regard to the wisdom of an inheritance tax, but that, too, he would postpone until a more convenient season. He did not seriously object to the valuation of railroads, but he did not declare for it immediately. He is on his way to the Philippines to tell the Filipinos that, while he thinks they ought to have self-government after while, he wants it postponed for the present. It is not strange, therefore, that he should yield to his ruling spirit in the matter of statehood and tell you to put it off.

He holds out the hope of another enabling act, but what assurance can he give that a republican congress will act immediately to bring in a democratic state just before a presidential election? You have been struggling for statehood for some fifteen years and now when it is within your grasp, he asks you to exchange a certainty for the delusive promise of another chance. Does he control the congress to such an extent that he can guarantee immediate action? The two senators from his own state do not accept his advice. His influence as a presidential candidate cannot yet be measured, for not a single state has yet instructed for him. There are at least three other presidential candidates, who are likely to have their own states behind them—Knox, of Pennsylvania; Fairbanks, of Indiana; and Cannon, of Illinois. Fairbanks is the president of the senate, Cannon is the speaker of the house, and Knox represents Pennsylvania in the senate. Can he give the

pledge of these men that congress will act at once and insure statehood before November, 1908, and, if the other presidential candidates promised it, is there any assurance that the republican members of the senate and house would consent? Even if a majority of both the senate and the house favored statehood, the opposition could talk the measure to death in the senate, where they have no rule for closing the debate. If you are to trade your birthright for a mess of pottage, you ought at least to be sure of receiving the pottage.

But why does he advise you to reject the constitution and postpone statehood? Because he is opposed to some parts of the constitution. He has suggested several amendments which he would like to have adopted. Even if the amendments which he proposed were good amendments and worthy to be adopted, it would not be necessary to reject the constitution in order to adopt them. He speaks of the federal constitution as a model one and praises it in unqualified terms, and yet, when that constitution was adopted, it was so unsatisfactory that ten amendments were adopted immediately afterward. These amendments were all proposed during the discussion which preceded the adoption of the constitution, but the people said "Adopt the constitution now and amend it afterwards," and this advice was followed. The country secured a constitution and a government and then proceeded to adopt the amendments desired. If Secretary Taft had the confidence he ought to have in your people, he would have given you the same advice that our forefathers followed a century and a quarter ago. The democrats can vote in favor of the constitution because they believe it a good one; the republicans who desire to change it can have as their slogan "Adopt the constitution now, amend it afterwards." It is much safer to postpone amendments to the constitution of Oklahoma than it was to postpone amendments to the federal constitution. First, because it is easier to amend the constitution of Oklahoma. To amend the federal constitution it is necessary to have the amendment ratified by three-fourths of the states, after being proposed by two-thirds of both houses of congress or by a constitutional convention; whereas, the constitution

of Oklahoma can be amended by a majority vote of the people, and the amendments can be proposed either by a majority vote of the legislature or by a small percentage of the people acting through petition. The initiative and referendum make amendment so easy that no republican can find an excuse for rejecting the Oklahoma constitution, unless he is really opposed to statehood and prefers to have the territory governed through officials appointed from Washington.

But there is a second reason why it is safer to adopt the Oklahoma constitution than it was the federal constitution, viz.: because the amendments suggested by Secretary Taft deal with the property rights, while the amendments adopted to the federal constitution deal with human rights. If you will compare the ten amendments adopted immediately after the adoption of the federal constitution, you will find that they were of vital importance and materially affected the life and liberties of the people, while all amendments proposed by Secretary Taft deal almost entirely with property rights, and those property rights do not concern the property of individuals but the property of corporations. Surely, if our forefathers could adopt a constitution that needed ten amendments, dealing with important questions and difficult to secure, the people of Oklahoma can afford to adopt the splendid constitution that has been submitted, when the amendments proposed by Secretary Taft are not material and, if they were material, could be easily secured by the people.

There is one passage in his speech which I do not understand and which seems to contain a covert threat. He says that he is confident that there would be a new enabling act if this constitution was rejected and that there probably would be "an organization of the organized territory of Indian Territory until you could get ready for joint statehood." and that "you would pass in with a constitution made up by persons who are not so patriotic and not so full of the desire to exactly ascertain the will of the people." The last part of the sentence may be intended for sarcasm, although it is surprising that a candidate for president should speak sarcastically about an effort to ascertain the will of the

people. What can be more important than to find out what the people want and to make government conform to the wishes of the voters? But the covert threat is contained in the earlier part of the sentence, where he suggests that the Indian Territory might be kept out until after the Territory of Oklahoma has adopted a constitution. That construction can be placed upon his language, although the language is so ambiguous that it is not absolutely certain what he does mean. Does he mean to reopen the question of double statehood? Or does he mean that the people living in the Indian Territory are to be denied representation until after the people of Oklahoma have a chance to adopt a constitution? Would he exclude the people of the Indian Territory because they are democratic? Surely, statesmanship has fallen to a low plane if political rights are secure only when the voter votes a particular ticket or connects himself with a particular party.

But what are the objections Secretary Taft finds to the constitution. First, he is opposed to the initiative and the referendum. This to him is a fatal defect, and why? Because the initiative and referendum enable the people to control their own government. Experience has shown that with the growth of corporate wealth an influence has entered into politics which was absent when our government was founded. Corporations desiring municipal franchises have corrupted city councils and secured franchises of enormous value without consulting the people. To prevent this the referendum has been adopted in many of our cities and will ultimately be adopted in all of them. Because railroads and other large corporations have exerted a demoralizing influence over state legislatures, the initiative and referendum have been proposed for the protection of the peopl of the state, and, because the people of Oklahoma have dared to express more faith in the voters than in those chosen to represent the voters, Secretary Taft would have you postpone statehood. He is on his way to the Pacific coast. According to his published itinerary he will pass through South Dakota; will he rebuke the republicans of South Dakota for having adopted the initiative and referendum in that state? He will also

pass through Montana. Will he rebuke the republicans of Montana, who have also adopted the initiative and referendum? He is likely to speak in Oregon, and there, too, the republicans have adopted the initiative and referendum. Will he expend his wrath upon them, or has he so exhausted his energies in denouncing the initiative and referendum in a democratic state as to be speechless when he talks to the republicans of the far west? In the state of Ohio, one branch of the legislature has already endorsed the initiative and referendum and the other branch is pledged to do so when the legislature reconvenes this winter. Is it a crime for Oklahoma to do what other states have done and what Ohio is preparing to do, viz., enlarge the power of the people to control their own representatives?

The secretary says that, according to the Oklahoma constitution, the legislature can repeal a law passed by the people and that the people can pass it again and the legislature repeal it again. He ought to commend this rather than condemn it for, if the constitution had provided that a law passed by the people could not be repealed by the legislature, he would have been sure to criticise that, for that would have resulted in the enactment of two kinds of laws, but he forgets that the referendum, as well as the initiative, is provided for by the constitution and that if the legislature attempts to repeal a law passed by the people, they can sit in judgment upon that attempt, as upon other acts of legislature. And why not have the referendum? If a governor can veto a measure passed by a legislature, why deny that power to the people who elect both governor and legislature?

His second objection to the constitution is found in the clause that prevents the consolidation of railroads. This objection will hardly be treated seriously by the public, for surely the people have a right to prevent consolidation if they want to, and if they find that they have injured themselves by preventing consolidation, they can easily amend their constitution so as to permit consolidation. And it will be much easier to secure such an amendment with the aid of the railroads than

it would be to secure an amendment preventing consolidation with the railroads opposing such an amendment.

He is also alarmed lest the railroads will take advantage of the four-mile proposition and compel the county seats to furnish the right of way. His anxiety on this subject also is without foundation, for the county seats can protect themselves by refusing to furnish the right of way if they think they are being held up. But it is amusing to see him objecting to one provision because it favors the railroads and to another because it opposes the railroads. The least he could do would be to pair these two objections and let one offset the other.

His fourth objection, however, is more amusing; it is ludicrous. He says: "Fourthly, and I have to refer to something not in the constitution, I believe, because it was stricken out by amendment, and that is the provision by which foreign corporations would lose the right to do business if they take a suit into federal court." He is certainly driven to an extremity when he has to make his objection to a provision that has been stricken out. He regards the provision as a very bad one, and instead of congratulating the convention upon striking it out, he uses it as an objection to the constitution of which it was formerly a part. I think they ought to have left the provision in, for a state has a right to prescribe the terms upon which foreign corporations do business in the state, and I know of no more reasonable condition than that the foreign corporation shall submit itself to the state courts? This provision did not originate in Oklahoma. More than twenty years ago a similar provision was adopted in the state of Wisconsin, and the supreme court has held that it is a valid provision, and the secretary ought to know that this provision has been adopted in various states because of the manner in which corporations have abused their right to invoke the aid of the United States courts. Litigants have been dragged into courts distant from them and worn out with delays and court expenses, until the people of the states have found it necessary to protect themselves by this kind of a provision. The fact that Secretary Taft finds fault with such a provision is conclusive

proof that he looks at such questions from the standpoint of the corporations and not from the standpoint of the people. It shows that his sympathies are with the great aggregations of wealth and not with the God-made man, whose rights have been trampled upon and whose interests have been disregarded.

In presenting his fourth argument he takes occasion to advance the time-worn argument that capital is timid and must be very carefully nursed and pampered. He says: "You know capital can protect itself; it is not obliged to go to one state or the other. All you have to do is to show capital that when it comes to your state it will have a square deal. If you can do that, capital will come. If you cannot do that, it will not come." It is the old plea that all laws must be made for capital and none for the protection of the rights of the individual. How different is the secretary's speech from the speeches of Abraham Lincoln, wherein he asserted that, while the republican party believed in both the man and the dollar, it believed in the man before the dollar. Secretary Taft, on the contrary, believes in the dollar first and the man afterward, if at all, and he puts property rights so much above human rights that he would have you delay statehood until you can offer greater inducements to capital. With Lincoln it was "a government of the people, by the people and for the people," that was to be preserved to posterity. With Secretary Taft it is a government of capital, by capital and for capital that is to be fastened on you, or else statehood is not to be desired.

And then he tells you that he is talking business. "Now I am talking practical sense," he says; "I am not talking demagoguery or sentiment, I am talking business." Yes, he uses the terms and phrases of those who regard as statesmen only those whose ears are trained to catch the slightest pulsations of the pocket-book and who regard as demagogues all who attempt to place restrictions upon corporate wealth or defend the right of the masses to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

His next objection to the constitution is that it protects the laboring men from what is known as govern-

ment by injunction, by insuring them a trial by jury if the contempt complained of is committed outside the presence of the court. A bill to this effect passed the United States senate some twelve years ago, but as soon as the corporations found out about it they strangled the measure in the house. He makes an elaborate argument in favor of the injunction, but he does not meet the issue involved. The purpose of government by injunction is to enable the corporate employer to deny the laboring man trial by jury. The secretary says that trial by jury is not guaranteed in equity proceedings, but that is the very thing for which the constitution of Oklahoma provides. It is true that in other states and in the United States courts the judges have sometimes used the equity side of the court in order to deprive the laboring man of his constitutional guarantees. According to the criminal law, a laboring man is liable to punishment if he destroys property; according to the common law, he is liable to damages if he injures property, but the corporations have fallen into the habit of depriving the laboring man of the protection thrown about him when charged with a crime, or when prosecuted under the common law, and it is to restore to him the protection of trial by jury that this provision of the constitution was inserted, and I submit that, as long as a convicted criminal, when charged with another crime, is entitled to a trial by jury, a laboring man ought not be denied a trial by jury when he has never been convicted of a crime. Before leaving this subject I may add that the president in his last message referred to the abuses that have grown up in the use of the writ of injunction, and suggested that it would be necessary to take some action to restrain the use of the writ if the abuses continue. It is to be regretted that these abuses have not impressed Secretary Taft as they have the president, for he sees nothing but good in the writ. Additional proof of his prejudice against the laboring man is found in his objection to the provision compelling corporations to consent to arbitration.

The secretary complains that the railway commission can fine a railroad for disobeying an order and that trial by jury is not provided in such a case. I think I

can guarantee that a democratic legislature will provide for trial by jury in such cases, if the railroads want it, but trial by jury is the one thing that the railroads do not want.

Another objection upon which Secretary Taft places great stress is that the state has been so districted that the republicans might have a majority of 30,000 in the state without electing the legislature. I do not know how accurate the secretary's statement is, but I know that there is scarcely a state of the size of Oklahoma in which it might not be possible for one party to carry the state by 30,000 and the other party control the legislature. I know that in the republican states of Connecticut and Rhode Island it is practically impossible for the democrats to elect the legislature even though they have a large majority in the state. In Rhode Island, for instance, we have eletced the governor several times within recent years but cannot get the legislature, the reason being that their legislative districts are arranged on the basis of area rather than population. Little towns of a few hundred population elect as many representatives as great cities with many thousands of population. The legislative districts of Connecticut and Rhode Island are far more unfair than the legislative districts of Oklahoma, and yet Secretary Taft has not raised his voice in favor of justice in these republican states. The congressional districts of Ohio are more unfair than the legislative districts of Oklahoma, and the districts from which the delegates to the constitutional convention were elected in Oklahoma were more unfair and partisan than the legislative districts. Unfairness in districting a state cannot be defended, no matter what party is guilty of it, but it is inconsistent in Secretary Taft to make the objection in Oklahoma when he does not make it in other states and when he did not make objection to the partisan districting that preceded the constitutional election. As a matter of fact, the constitution compels justice in districting when the population is ascertained.

I cannot speak as to your school taxation, but I am sure that your people are so much interested in the education of their children that they will correct any mis-

take that the convention has made. It is not necessary that statehood should be delayed in order to secure educational facilities, for these can be easily provided by an amendment to the constitution, if the constitution does not already make adequate provision.

But Secretary Taft says that, if you insist on having statehood and are determined to adopt the constitution, you ought to have a republican government to amend the constitution. He certainly has forgotten the argument he made in Ohio recently, that the tariff ought to be reformed by its friends. If he applies his logic to this constitution, he ought to insist that the constitution should be reformed by its friends, rather than by its enemies, and surely there is little to induce confidence in the republican party when that party has delayed statehood for so many years, and delayed it for purely partisan reasons. The republican party to secure partisan advantage admitted several western states that were not nearly so well fitted for statehood as Oklahoma, but your people have long suffered the disadvantages of a territorial government merely because they did not approve of the policies of the republican party. Now they are asked to reward the republican party for the punishment it has inflicted upon them. But if this argument appeals to republicans who oppose the constitution, the democrats and the many republicans who favor the constitution will find in the president's speech additional reasons for supporting the democratic ticket and thus rewarding the party which has submitted a constitution so good that even the republican convention of Oklahoma did not dare to express disapproval of it. The secretary has shown a good deal of boldness in asking you to repudiate a constitution that a republican convention was not willing to condemn.

The secretary, after picking out everything that seemed objectionable and ignoring every provison of the constitution that seemed good, proceeded to make an argument in favor of republican policies in the nation. He asked you to cast your lot with the republican party rather than with the democratic party. If he had been frank with you, he would have told you that the only popularity the republican party has is due to its

adoption of a part of the democratic platform. But if he told you that, you would have replied that it was better to join the democratic party and lead a reform than to join the republican party and follow hesitatingly after the democratic party has pointed out the way.

He appeals to you to stand by protection, although he did not enter into any argument on the subject. Have you read his Columbus speech? If so you will find in it an arraignment of protection as we have it today—an appeal for a revision of the tariff, but he paralyzes the force of his own speech by postponing the tariff reform until after the election. Tariff reform is never undertaken by the republicans just after a republican victory because the victory is taken as an endorsement of the policy, and is never undertaken before an election for fear it will interfere with another republican victory. The people of Oklahoma have no interest in the maintenance of a purely protective system, for they sell in the open markets of the world and buy in the restricted markets of America. The cotton raised in Oklahoma sells for the same whether it is made up into cloth in the United States or in Europe, for the foreign price fixes the price here, and the same may be said of the wheat, the corn and the cattle produced by the farmers of Oklahoma. And yet, when the farmers attempt to invest their income in the things which they need, they not only find prices increased by the protective tariff but still further increased by the combinations which manufacturers have formed to take advantage of the tariff. The farmers of Oklahoma will find little consolation in the fact that, while American manufactures sell abroad cheaper than at home, republican leaders like Secretary Taft are insisting that no reform shall be attempted except through the republican party and with the consent of the tariff barons themselves.

Secretary Taft did not discuss the trust question; he wisely avoided it because he favors taking a backward step on that question.

Secretary Taft also made a plea in favor of imperialism. Well, the people of Oklahoma have had enough experience with carpet-bag government to know something about a colonial policy. If officers appointed by

the federal government are so unsatisfactory, what must be the feeling of the Filipinos against officials of another race sent across the ocean to administer a government? I am glad that Secretary Taft has referred to the Philippine question, for his discussion shows that he believes in a colonial policy and that he disputes the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence. While he himself seems disposed to acquiesce in the suffrage amendments adopted in the south, he overlooks the fact that the black man of the south is treated much better than the brown man of the Philippines. The black man of the south has the protection of the constitutions, state and national, while the constitution is denied to the Filipino. The black man of the south has also the protection of living under laws which the white man makes for himself, while the Filipino lives under laws which the white man makes for the Filipino, laws under which the white man would not himself be willing to live.

Then, too, the secretary confuses two questions that are entirely distinct. The question in the south is not whether the black man is capable of self-government; it is whether he is capable of conducting a government under which the white man as well as the black man must live; in other words, whether he is capable of governing the white man; while the question in the Philippines is whether the brown man is capable of governing himself. For the white man of the south to insist, as a matter of self-preservation, on administering the government under which both he and the black man must live is one thing; for the white man to cross the Pacific ocean and fasten a government on an alien people is entirely another proposition, and the secretary is confused on fundamental principles if he cannot see the distinction. Imperialism costs us more than one hundred millions a year, weakens us by exposing us to foreign attack and lays us open to the suspicion of having abandoned the idea of self-government.

I am glad that you have had the benefit of Secretary Taft's advice, for if anything was needed to convince the voters of Oklahoma that the constitution is a good one, the proof has been furnished by the fact that Secretary

Taft's criticisms have been aimed at the very parts which protect the people against predatory wealth, and the people of Oklahoma ought to show their appreciation of the splendid constitution submitted to them by giving an overwhelming endorsement to Mr. Haskell and his colleagues upon the ticket. Mr. Haskell and several of the other state candidates played an important part in the shaping of the constitution, and the party which has placed them in nomination can claim the credit of inaugurating a government, republican in form, democratic in spirit and in harmony with the sentiments of the people.

Speaking of the democratic candidates in Oklahoma Mr. Bryan said:

"I find an especial pleasure in saying a word in behalf of Mr. Haskell, your candidate for governor. He was a friend in the days when I needed friends. Two years before the Chicago convention he was chairman of the committee on resolutions in his congressional district and voted for the adoption of the money plank that afterward presented the paramount issue of the campaign of 1896, and when I was a candidate in 1896, his county, largely through his efforts, gave me 2,600 majority. That being one of the strongholds of the democratic party the gold democrats sought to divide our vote by selecting two electors for the gold ticket from that county. But they succeeded in securing only eleven votes in the whole county for the Palmer and Buckner ticket.

"I am glad to be able to pay back in this campaign a part of the debt that I owe to Mr. Haskell for his services when I needed friends. And, aside from my gratitude, I rejoice that your state is to be launched upon its career under the guidance of so strong, so able, and so faithful a democrat.

"Surely those who have given you your constitution and placed you among the foremost of the reform states of this union are deserving of your gratitude. Many states have constitutions satisfactory to the representatives of predatory wealth. Oklahoma's constitution ought to be satisfactory to the producing masses. The democrats have selected five members of the constitu-

tional convention for places upon the state ticket, and the other candidates are all in sympathy with the constitution and its aims.

"As I have mentioned my personal appreciation of Mr. Haskell, I might add that I have also been brought in contact with Mr. Williams, one of the candidates for the supreme bench. He is a member of the democratic national committee and my acquaintance with him has led me to admire more and more his intellect, his moral courage and his broad sympathy with the people. Unless I am mistaken in measuring character he will prove himself entirely worthy of the great responsibilities that will rest upon him.

"It is important that the senators from Oklahoma shall represent the masses rather than the great corporations. We surely need such men in the senate. The democratic candidates, Mr. Gore and Mr. Owens, measure up to the requirements. In the house the five democratic members from Oklahoma may cast the deciding vote on important legislation.

"The president has proposed the national incorporation of railroads and other corporations engaged in interstate commerce. As I have praised the president whenever he has recommended anything good, I shall not hesitate to criticise this proposal as one of the most dangerous devices in recent years. Its object is to transfer from the states to the nation entire control of railroads and other large corporations.

"And, my friends, because of my personal acquaintance with him, I want to say one word about your candidate for congress in this district. Mr. Fulton lived in my district when I was a candidate for congress fifteen and seventeen years ago and I had no more faithful, loyal supporter in my campaign. At that time, this young man had developed a character that made him admired and loved by all who knew him then; but he has had fifteen years added to his intellectual stature, and he has grown in strength and character, and I rejoice that you, in this district, are likely to have as your congressman, a man who fills my ideal as to what a congressman ought to be in the United States. I believe that he has the abilty. I believe that he has the strength of will,

and I know that his heart beats in sympathy with the toiling masses of his state. I know him so well, that I am willing to endorse in advance, any speech he will make, every vote he will cast, and if he goes wrong, charge it up to me—I stand behind him."

LOCATING THE BLAME

The National Union of Railway Trackmen—the section hands—have intervened in the discussion as to where the blame for so many disastrous railway wrecks should properly be placed, and the trackmen offer facts and figures to prove that they have located the blame.

The executive committee of the National Union of Railway Trackmen has just issued a letter in which is given in detail certain practices and conditions that prevail in the track department of practically every railroad in the country. These disclosures reveal that a majority of the wrecks, instead of being caused by overworked employes, mistaken signals, or running by blocks, are really caused by improper maintenance of track. Accompanying the report of this committee are a number of photographs of main line tracks in western states, and these photographs show rotten ties that menace the lives of all who ride over them. To the presence of these rotten ties is due in a large measure the numerous broken rails which furnish the excuse for so many wrecks. The men into whose hands is given the keeping and maintenance of safe tracks, thus insuring safety to railroad patrons riding in the heavy and swift trains, receive an average of less than $1.25 a day, ten hours a day. The foremen of track gangs, "section bosses," receive less than $50 a month.

The committee further charges that in addition to employing an insufficient number of men and paying them insufficient wages, the railroads refuse or neglect to furnish proper material or equipment, and then lay the blame upon the trackmen if a wreck occurs because of insecure track. The committee further says:

"In addition to not employing enough men, or fur-

nishing sufficient material, the tracks as a rule are not patrolled either night or day. In the early days of railroading when there were not nearly so many trains operated as now, and those that were operated were of much lighter equipment, and run at a lower speed, it was considered necessary for the safety of those who traveled on the railway trains, that good careful men should patrol the tracks during the day time and at night also, if trains were operated at night. These men, who patrolled the tracks, were required to carry signalling appliances, so that they might notify train crews of danger. They were also expected and required to carry tools with which to tighten loose bolts and spikes. Now-a-days no such thing is done at all, except on some of the eastern roads, although the necessity for patrolling tracks is a hundred per cent greater now than ever before. Trains starting from a station at night plunge off into the darkness, and the men running them and the passengers riding thereon, must trust to blind luck for safety in reaching their destination. In places where there are overhanging rocks and high bluffs along the right of way, safe railroading would dictate that special guards should be provided for these and that they be not left as they now are, entirely unprotected. We ought not wonder at the frequency and serious nature of railway wrecks; the wonder should be, that there are not more of them and with greater fatalities."

These facts have repeatedly been called to the attention of railway managers by the trackmen, but the matter has been ignored by the officials and the unjust and dangerous conditions maintained. The National Union of Railway Trackmen have now decided to appeal to public sentiment for redress of grievances and the enforcement of ordinary precautions for the safeguarding of life and property. They make the following frank and manly statement to the public:

"Ordinarily a labor union, when it fails to secure a redress of the wrong of its members, orders a strike. Had we done this, you probably would have criticised us. In the past many of you have said that there was no need to strike, that the contentions of labor organi-

zations, if right, could best be settled by public sentiment. We cannot strike. Our people can scarcely live on their present wages and work all the time. We have come to you for help and we are stating our case in an honest and fair way. You and each of you are as much interested in having the dangerous conditions, which we have called to your attention, remedied, as are we. We have inspection by the state almost everywhere for factories and mines. This is done to protect employes alone. In this great transportation industry, with the hundreds of thousands of miles of railway track, no one is responsible for their condition. Each railroad system and division thereof is operated in a different way. There is no standard of efficiency required for service in the track department. In some instances the entire section crew of laborers is composed of boys under fifteen years of age. There should be either state or national inspection of railway tracks. As we view it, the most perfect remedy would be to so extend the powers of the interstate commerce commission that it would have jurisdiction over this matter. Sure it is that something must be done."

The committee proceeds then to offer statistical proof of their contention. They show by the interstate commerce commission records that during the years 1903-1906 there were 22,384 derailments of trains, causing a property loss of $19,434,095, killing 1,614 people and injuring 17,442 others. These derailments have averaged over 500 a month for the last three years, the death list has averaged over 500 a year, and the injured list has averaged over 5,500 a year—all caused by derailments due, according to the showing made by the trackmen, to the failure to properly maintain tracks.

The National Union of Railway Trackmen deserves the sympathy and support of the general public in their fight for better wages and conditions. Further than that, the general public owes it to itself to assist the trackmen because of what has been called "enlightened selfishness"—self-protection.

THE OKLAHOMA VICTORY

It is not necessary to say that the result in Oklahoma is a great victory for democrats. The victory speaks for itself.

It is not necessary to say that the faithful democrats of Oklahoma and Indian Territory are entitled to the highest praise for the good work they have accomplished. From every section of the country come words of congratulation to the democrats of the new state that is prepared to enter the union under particularly fortunate conditions.

Particularly fortunate, we say, because Oklahoma's brief history is inseparably associated with the idea of popular government. When it came to the selection of men who were to write the constitution for the new state it was urged by many that Oklahomans, regardless of political prejudice, ought to entrust that duty to the party just then dominant in the federal government. But in the campaign for the constitutional convention the promise of democrats seemed to accord with the purpose of the Oklahomans to obtain a charter that would make it plain to all men that government of the people, by the people, for the people was to be the shibboleth for the new state.

The result was the democrats won by a large majority in the constitutional convention.

It is not an idle statement to say that the proceedings of Oklahoma's constitutional convention were marked with a determination on the part of its members to prepare a constitution that would insure to the people of the new state practical control, for all time, over their public affairs and their public servants.

It is no idle statement to say that never in the history of deliberative assemblies has any body of men been accorded more general recognition for patriotic effort than was given by men of all parties to Oklahoma's constitutional convention.

In all the proceedings of that great gathering there was no breath of scandal. No one complained that the members of the convention were looking out for special interests. No one suggested that their work left

loop holes for corporations. It was said that the constitution was too long but some who made that complaint meant that it was too explicit in its efforts to safeguard the public interests. When the attorney-general for the United States pointed out what he conceived to be certain defects the constitutional convention made correction accordingly.

It is not strange, then, that it was with some degree of confidence that the men who wrote this constitution submitted their work for the approval of their fellow citizens. With significant emphasis the people of the new state have approved that work and they did it in the face of the implied threat that approval of the constitution and a democratic victory meant rejection of the constitution by a president elected as a republican.

The strong personality of Mr. Roosevelt figured conspicuously in the Oklahoma campaign. Every federal officeholder in the two territories was fighting hard for republican victory; and not only was the great prestige of a national administration employed at every point, but the administration was represented in a particularly clear way by the personal participation of the heir apparent to Mr. Roosevelt's party robe. And when Mr. Taft bluntly advised the Oklahomans to vote against the democratic constitution his advice was freely interpreted as a reminder that the republican national administration had the power to unmake the constitution.

But these influences were of no avail. Oklahoma and Indian Territory, ambitious for statehood, wanted to insure for the new commonwealth popular government in its best sense. To this end they entrusted the work of making a constitution to the democratic party and the democratic party proved itself faithful to the trust.

The fidelity shown by the democratic constitutional convention and the purpose displayed by the democratic candidates for office have been recognized and rewarded by a victory so complete that it must give encouragement to all men who participate in politics in the hope of deriving from government "the greatest good to the greatest number."

WELCOME, OKLAHOMA

The Commoner extends to Oklahoma hearty congratulations upon the decisive vote cast in favor of the constitution and immediate statehood, and it also congratulates the state upon the election of the democratic ticket. The new state enters the sisterhood of states fully prepared for the responsibilities which she assumes. Her constitution—the best in the union—was framed by democrats and her government is placed in the hands of democrats. She starts upon her career under favorable conditions. Now let the president bow to the will of the people expressed at the polls, and say the word that makes Oklahoma a state. Welcome Oklahoma!

"BACK TO THE PEOPLE"

Some one has told the Kansas City Post that Mr. Bryan will undertake to dictate to the democratic party and the Post occupies considerable space in knocking down the straw man. The Post says: "The Post, which does not stand in awe or dread of the power of any man or set of men, protests against the interference of Mr. Bryan, or the dictation of any man with the freedom of action, freedom of expression of the democracy of county, state or nation."

A democratic paper ought not to be so ready to fasten upon Mr. Bryan every charge made by his political opponents. For a paper which insists that it "does not stand in awe or dread of the power of any man," the Kansas City Post takes fright very easily. Its two column protest is unnecessary. Mr. Bryan has no desire to play the role of dictator. He has no desire to interfere with "the freedom of action, freedom of expression of the democracy of county, state or nation." On the contrary he stands for the perfect freedom of action and the entire freedom of expression not only of the democracy of the nation but the democracy of the state and of the county, and not only that but the democracy of the precinct. He would have every democrat

in every precinct in the United States attend the primaries of his party to the end that in the selection of candidates and in the framing of a platform the "freedom of action and the freedom of expression" of the American democracy shall not in any way be checked by the decree of any one man or of any coterie of men.

Repeatedly Mr. Bryan has said that in 1908 the candidate will be chosen and the platform will be written according to the decree of the rank and file of democrats who will give expression to their views in precinct, county and state gatherings and finally in their national convention.

VIRGINIA VS. PENNSYLVANIA

The people of Virginia voted $1,000,000 for the erection of a capitol building at Richmond. A magnificent structure was the result, but the public officials having the matter in charge have put themselves in disfavor with the Pennsylvania gentlemen who attended to the construction of the Keystone state's capitol. The Richmond building cost only $600,000 and $400,000 of the appropriation was covered back into the state treasury. The Virginia capitol cost the Virginians less than the graft worked on the Pennsylvania capitol in the one item of bronze work alone. The graft worked in Pennsylvania on the one item of furniture for the new capitol would have paid for the erection of two such buildings as the one to which loyal Virginians point with pride. The difference between the Pennsylvania building and the Virginia building is that the former was built by dishonest men who robbed the state, while the latter was built by patriotic men who looked after the best interests of their commonwealth. The former is the logical result of allowing a rotten political machine to run the state, the latter is the logical result of intelligent and honest participation in public affairs. It is to be hoped that at some time in the future the people of Pennsylvania will realize the necessity of running their

own public affairs instead of leaving them to the tender mercies of a political machine that hesitates at no crime calculated to perpetuate its hold upon the public revenues.

OKLAHOMA WINS

The president has announced to the newspaper men that he will approve of Oklahoma's constitution. He says that what he thinks of the constitution would not be fit to print but, suppressing his personal feelings, he expresses himself as willing to let the people have their way. Good for the president! And Hurrah for Oklahoma!

But the manner in which the president yields raises an interesting question. Is it not possible that Secretary Taft went to Oklahoma as a part of the plan to first reduce the majority and then reject the constitution? Is it not possible that the president would have postponed statehood if the people had adopted the constitution by a small majority or by electing a republican state ticket, giving the president a chance to avoid the charge of partisanship?

It is fortunate for Oklahoma that the constitution was ratified by an overwhelming majority and the state offices put in the hands of democrats. It left no other excuse than a partisan one for the delay of statehood. After all, the voice of the people has force in it, and the president has wisely bowed to the demand for statehood so emphatically made by the people of Oklahoma. Again is Oklahoma to be congratulated and again are the "unterrified democrats" of the new state to be thanked for the courage they have shown.

THE USE OF WEALTH

Mr. Charles M. Schwab is quoted as saying to the commercial travelers, "I have some money—quite a lot of it in fact. What good does it do me? I have a nice

place to live, good meals to eat and clothes to wear. That is about all, except that Mrs. Schwab is able to spend a few pennies and enjoy herself."

Schwab is right. Our needs are not so great after all. We must have food; we must have shelter; and we must have clothes, and a man does not have to be a millionaire to have all the food and all the clothes and all the shelter that he needs and can use to advantage. Great fortunes are a great burden to those who use them wisely and a great calamity to those who use them foolishly, and yet, there are a number of American citizens who go on fighting for millions that they do not need and to secure these millions they violate laws, human and divine. And when they are through, they find that they have not improved upon the wisdom of Solomon, who said: "Give me neither riches nor poverty," and who declared, "a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches and loving favor rather than silver or gold."

MAN VS. MONEY

The press dispatches contain an interview recently given out by Admiral Dewey on the Philippine question. He is quoted as saying:

"Abandon the Philippines? I don't believe our country will ever do that. Certainly it should not, because it has already too much at stake. It is only our control over the Philippines that makes it possible for us to insist upon the open door in the East, toward which our diplomacy has been directed for a number of years. We want our share of the enormous commerce of the East, and we can't keep the door open for it unless we hold the islands. I want to emphasize my belief that the United States as a world power will always have commercial and diplomatic interests in the far East and cannot maintain itself properly without a base of operations. The United States cannot withdraw from its present enterprise in the East but must go forward seeking

its share of the advantages and sustaining its share of the responsibilities."

What does this mean? Can it be that our talk of being in the Philippines against our will and that it was providential; that it is good for the Filipinos that we are there and that we cannot leave the Philippines without doing injustice to the natives—can it be that all these arguments are merely pretense and that our real object is to get our share of the trade of the Orient? Admiral Dewey tears the mask off of the Philippine question and it stands forth as a commercial transaction in which dollars are placed above principles of government, and money is elevated above men.

It is not necessary that we should assume control over eight millions of people in order to have coaling stations and naval bases in the Philippine Islands. The Filipinos will be only too glad to let us retain whatever land we need. In fact, if we are to protect them, they will want us to have coaling stations and naval bases there, but it is not necessary that we should adopt a colonial policy or force our government upon the Filipinos against their will. We can give them their independence and let them run their own government. Our commercial interests would not be jeopardized by a return to American principles, but it is interesting to know that all this talk about Providence and about the welfare of the Filipinos is buncombe and that the dollar argument is the argument that weighs with the imperialist. There was a time when American citizens would not talk about bartering away the doctrine of self-government, and that time will return. The Philippine experiment has, however, answered a useful purpose. It has taken the veneer off of a few statesmen who, until the battle of Manila was fought, were supposed to favor the Declaration of Independence and the principles of free government.

WHY NOT TO OTHERS?

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association, to which all of the large daily newspapers—including re-

publican papers—belong, adopted at its last meeting this resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that the duty on printing paper, wood pulp and all material entering into the manufacture of printing paper be immediately repealed.

In the face of this resolution republican newspaper editors continue to preach high protective tariff and continue to assert that the foreigner pays the tax. These republican papers protest against any reduction in the tariff for the benefit of consumers generally. They would not give their support to the plank adopted several years ago by the republicans of Iowa providing for the destruction of the shelter which the trusts find in the tariff and even at this moment most of these republican papers are protesting against any interference with the sacred Dingley rates, while those who harkened to the popular demand insist that there should be no revision until after the presidential election of 1908. When men who have felt the burden of tariff taxation have preached reduction or have pleaded for a revenue tariff they have been called free traders by the gentlemen editing the republican papers belonging to the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. But what do we find these republican editors doing now? In their editorial columns they are either protesting against tariff revision or insisting upon postponing revision until after the presidential election while in their newspaper association they are demanding upon the product most vitally affecting their own business not a reduction of the tariff but a repeal of all the duty—absolutely free trade; and they do not propose that this relief be postponed until after the presidential election; they propose that it shall be "immediately repealed."

Why, then, deny the same boon to consumers generally?

DEFENDING THE STATES

An important memorial was prepared by the attorneys of the various states represented at the national meeting of attorneys general held at St. Louis last week. Mr. Hadley, attorney-general of Missouri, was made president of the association; Mr. Malone, attorney-general of Massachusetts, vice-president, and Mr. Dickson, attorney-general of Colorado, secretary and treasurer. It will be noticed that all three of the officers are republicans, although Attorney-General Davidson, of Texas, Attorney-General Fletcher, of Mississippi, Attorney-General Garber, of Alabama, and a number of other officials from democratic states took part in the meeting. The memorial prepared by these gentlemen and to be presented to congress reads as follows:

"Whereas, The efficient administration, as well as the preservation of our dual system of government requires that each sovereignty be permitted to exercise its functions as defined by the federal constitution unhampered by the other; therefore be it

"Resolved, By the convention of attoneys general of the several states here assembled, that we earnestly recommend to the favorable consideration of the president and the congress of the United States the enactment of a federal law providing that no circuit court of the United States or any judge exercising powers of such circuit courts shall have jurisdiction in any case brought to restrain any officers of a state or any administrative board of a state from instituting in a state court any suit or other appropriate proceeding to enforce the laws of such state, or to enforce any order made by such administrative board, but allowing any person or corporation asserting in any such action in a state court any right arising under the constitution or any laws of the United States to have the decision of the highest court of such state reviewed by the supreme court of the United States as now provided by law.

"We also recommend that suits in federal circuit courts by persons interested in corporations to restrain such corporation from obeying the laws of states in which they are doing business be prohibited."

The doctrine set forth in the above memorial is democratic doctrine; it is in harmony with the position which the democratic party has ever taken, namely—that the distinction between the federal government and the states shall be observed according to the spirit of the constitution. The memorial is also in harmony with the platform recently adopted by the democrats of Nebraska. The United States judges have fallen into the habit of suspending the laws of the states at the request of the railroads, and as a result the states have been handicapped in their efforts to restrain or regulate such corporations. No corporation is denied justice when it is compelled to submit its claim to the state courts and then go up by appeal from the highest state court to the supreme court of the United States. It is gratifying to know that even the republican officials of the various states are beginning to recognize the importance of the states as a regulator of corporations, and every democrat in congress has given quick and constant support to the movement inaugurated by the attorneys general.

Corporations doing business in the state ought to submit themselves to the laws of the state. The fact that one stockholder may live in another state ought not to be sufficient to carry the case from the state to the federal court. Here, too, an appeal from the supreme court of the state is always possible if any constitutional rights have been violated.

The movement inaugurated by the attorneys general of the various states is not only a very important one, but it is also a very significant one; it shows that the democratic position on this subject is so clearly a righteous position that republicans as well as democrats accept it as soon as they see the opposite principle acted upon. The federal courts have furnished the object lessons, and the people have been apt pupils; they have at once confronted the danger involved in the overriding of state laws and in the destruction of the state courts, and they respond with earnestness to the democratic appeal in behalf of the right of the state to protect the people in matters which are local.

HOW WILL THEY EXPLAIN

The Newspaper Publishers' Association has formulated a demand that wood pulp and print paper be put upon the free list, declaring that the wood pulp and paper trust is taking advantage of the tariff to rob the publishers of the country. The truth of this declaration cannot be denied. But how will the members of the association who advocate a "standpat" tariff policy explain to their readers who are suffering from similar exactions at the hands of the clothing trust, the cordage trust, the harvester trust, the anthracite and bituminous coal trusts, the meat trust, and a score of other trusts, all of which are barricaded behind the walls of the tariff? Why should newspaper publishers who advocate a tariff on the necessaries of life consumed by the general public object to a tariff on the necessaries of the publishing concerns? A lot of "standpat" organ publishers will either have to do a lot of explaining to curious and inquisitive readers, or else resort to that very ancient dodge of "silent contempt."

WHY NOT SUBMIT IT TO THE PEOPLE?

In his speech at St. Louis Mr. Roosevelt said: "There are difficulties arising from our dual form of government. If they prove to be insuperable resort must be had to the power of amendment."

Mr. Roosevelt would exercise this "power of amendment" through "the spirit of broad interpretation" which he says "can be found in the constitution as it is."

Surely the interpretation will be just as broad as the corporations want it to be, wherever the corporations control the court.

But if, as Mr. Roosevelt said in the same speech, "the constitution is unchanged and unchangeable save by amendment in due form," and if public interests require, as he says they do, material change in the manner of exercising control over these corporations, why not un-

dertake the change in due form and with the people's consent rather than through "the spirit of broad interpretation?"

Certainly Mr. Roosevelt recognizes the advantages of having so radical a change brought about through the people's consent rather than through "the spirit of broad interpretation," which would mean, in this instance, that the men who happen to occupy positions on the bench would so interpret the law as to destroy our dual system of government. It would centralize all power over corporations at Washington and please, beyond all measure, not only every railroad trust magnate but the very gentleman who owes his remarkable popularity to the impression that he is seriously bent upon protecting the public from the exactions of these same magnates. Why not submit the question to the people, Mr. President? You have said on several occasions that public sentiment could be depended upon and that it would invariably crystalize in the right direction. Why not put this theory to the test and in the testing give the American people an opportunity to vote upon the proposition upon which Mr. Roosevelt and the railroad magnates are just now so harmonious?

THE HAGUE COURT

The Hague peace conference has not accomplished as much as the friends of peace had hoped. The nations represented wanted peace but each one was anxious that it should be secured without any sacrifice on its own part. Some of the nations wanted to discontinue the use of navies in the collection of private debts, and this would have been a long step in advance, but other nations objected on the theory that they might want to collect the debts due some of their citizens. Various propositions were presented, and some of them received considerable support, but the final outcome is a disappointment. It is hard to secure peace by agreement when so many nations are to be consulted and so many conflicting interests are to be harmonized. The peace

movement will make progress but that progress is not as rapid as it ought to be.

But why should the United States wait for an agreement with other nations? It has it within its sphere to promote peace at once. It can announce its own policy and thus set an example to other nations. This example may not be followed at once but it will give the friends of peace in other nations something to work for and an argument to use. For instance, our nation could announce—and it should do so—its determination not to use the navy for the collection of private debts. This would be a beginning. Other nations would, one after another, follow its example, and a public opinion would be formed which would in time compel all nations to abstain from wars for the collection of private debts.

There is another thing which our nation should do, and it should do it at once, namely, announce its willingness to enter into an agreement providing for the submission to an impartial tribunal, before the commencement of hostilities and the declaration of war, of all disputes which defy diplomatic settlement. If it will announce such a policy, it will find a number of other nations willing to make such an agreement, and these will set the pattern for the rest of the world. The failure of The Hague conference to accomplish what it ought to have accomplished gives our nation an opportunity to lead the way and become the dominating factor in the promotion of peace.

WHY "EXCEEDINGLY DESIRABLE?"

Mr. Burton, who is anxious to beat Tom Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland, denies that the Cleveland campaign "is to an exceptional extent complicated with national politics." Mr. Burton says that he wrote to Mr. Roosevelt and received the following reply:

"Oyster Bay, N. Y., September 17.—My Dear Mr. Burton: You put a hard question to me in your letter to Mr. Loeb. There are certain qualities of leadership you possess which could not be supplied by anyone else

in the House, and you have a mastery of certain subjects such as no other man in the house can hope to attain. For you to leave the House, therefore, would mean that in certain lines of leadership there would be a loss that cannot be made up. I would, therefore, be tempted to protest against your leaving if it were not for my profound conviction that it is exceedingly desirable that you should win out as mayor of Cleveland. In view of the fact that our democratic system undergoes its most severe strain in the government of our cities, I feel that it is of the utmost importance to have a man of your experience, power and your long training, theoretical and practical experience in public life, take such a position as that of the mayoralty of Cleveland. Accordingly if you ask my advice I should say make the fight. With all good wishes believe me faithfully yours,

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

Now just why is it "exceedingly desirable" that Mr. Burton should "win out as mayor of Cleveland?" Tom Johnson is "a man of power and long training, theoretical and practical experience in public life." It is not denied that he has given, as mayor of Cleveland, faithful service to the public interests. It is not denied that the people rightly have implicit confidence in him. Why, then, is it "exceedingly desirable" that such a man as Tom Johnson be defeated? Certainly the "democratic system" which Mr. Roosevelt says "undergoes its most severe strain in the government of our cities" has not been injured by the concern which Tom Johnson has ever shown for the public interests, by the great ability and zealous care he has ever exercised in behalf of the people of Cleveland.

A SHOCKING STORY

Elsewhere in this issue The Commoner presents a series of pictures showing the dilapidated condition of a railway track over which thousands of passengers are carried every day. The half-tones were made from photographs taken by officials of the National Union of

Railway Trackmen and filed with the Nebraska railroad commission. The complaint filed will be found elsewhere, together with statistics showing the loss of life and injuries sustained in railroad accidents. The pictures show the utter unconcern of the great corporation managers for the safety of life and limb. In order to increase dividends on stocks and bonds watered to the limit, they daily jeopardize the lives of millions of people. These pictures are of conditions by no means confined to the one road mentioned in the complaint; they might be pictures of actual conditions that exist on many other railroads in this country. The public should be awakened to the fact that those who travel upon the railroads are absolutely dependent for safety upon that class of railroad men who are the poorest paid in the service—the trackmen, or "section men" as they are better known. If these trackmen are not provided with material and given ample time, it follows that the track becomes unsafe. Material and men cost money which managers want to divide in the shape of dividends, therefore the track is left to become unsafe and often hurl scores of people to their death. This utter unconcern for the public safety seems to be characteristic of American railway managers. It is of a piece with the unconcern for the public health disclosed in the beef trust investigation.

It is time to cease juggling with words in referring to these conditions. They are criminal. The men responsible for them are criminals and should be dealt with as such. The life dashed out because of an accident due to unsafe track caused by a desire for dividends greater than a desire to safeguard life and limb is as much a murder as the life dashed out by the bludgeon of the highwayman. Pilate may have thought he washed the blood of the Nazarene from his hands, but the time came when he realized his mistake. Coroner's juries may exonerate railway managers from all blame for accidents due to greed and rapacity, but guilt remains, and sooner or later they will be called to an accounting which they cannot evade.

The pictures here presented tell a shocking story of disregard for human life in the race for material wealth.

They portray conditions which must be changed quickly if this country would not come to the position of regarding human life as of utterly no value when compared with wealth or power. The National Union of Railway Trackmen made up of the humble workmen who shovel dirt, tamp ties and spike rails, is doing the traveling public an immense favor by calling attention to the facts.

LET THE FOREIGNER PAY IT

The people of San Francisco asked for the removal of the protective tariff on building material, claiming that it was necessary in order to enable them to rebuild the stricken city. Congressman Kahn, republican, was in favor of it, but the republican party did not dare allow it. It would have afforded such a striking object lesson of the iniquities of the tariff that the people would have insisted upon revision, regardless of its effects upon the treasury of the republican national committee.

But why should Congressman Kahn, or any other republican, favor the abrogation of the tariff in so far as it relates to building material imported for the rebuilding of San Francisco? Wouldn't it be merely a concession to the foreigner who now, if republican theories are correct, pays the tax?

THE NEBRASKA PLATFORM

The New York Evening Post—The Nebraska democratic platform, which Mr. Bryan himself is supposed to have drafted, expresses the issue most felicitously: "While we favor the exercise by the general government of all its constitutional authority for the prevention of monopoly and for the regulation of interstate commerce, we insist that federal remedies shall be added to, and not substituted for, state remedies." Neither parties nor individuals have taken sides on this question

consistently, yet the question of state and federal functions has really been fundamental to most of the political activity of the present presidential term. That it will be the issue of chief popular interest in the canvass of next year we are not prepared to say, but if it does, there is already an immense amount of material on hand for its discussion.

St. Louis Republic—The Nebraska democratic platform is good enough to win on. Its declarations against centralization, monopolies and robber tariff were expected of a convention which indorsed Nebraska's foremost citizen.

Democrat-Chronicle, Des Moines, Ia.—There is nothing wild-eyed about any of this platform (the Nebraska platform). Republicans will have hard work convincing themselves that there is a single plank in it that is not good. We endorse unequivocally every word of it and will do all that lies in our power to shape it into the national platform and then into legislation.

108,759!

The official count of the Oklahoma vote according to a Guthrie, Okla., dispatch shows that the vote on the constitution stood, yeas 180,836, nays 72,077, the majority for the constitution being 108,759. Prohibition received 130,524 votes to 112,244 against, a majority of 18,280.

Majority for the constitution 108,759! And Messrs. Roosevelt and Taft expected the people of Oklahoma to repudiate that great charter!

A WORD TO DEMOCRATS

Has the democratic party a mission? If so, what is it? Does democracy stand for a code of political principles, or is it merely an organization formed to secure offices for its members? From the arguments that are

advanced by some of our metropolitan newspapers one would suppose that it had no concern about principles and little reason for existence.

There are a few metropolitan papers, calling themselves democratic, which are now urging the democratic party to become the exponent of predatory wealth. It were better for the party if these papers did not call themselves democratic, for they do the party far more injury by presuming to speak for it than they could do if they openly opposed the party. These papers not only misrepresent democratic sentiment themselves, but they constantly quote each other as the exponents of democratic sentiment, and what is worse, they are quoted by republican papers as reflecting democratic sentiment. They sometimes admit that the masses favor a progressive policy but in a "holier than thou" tone castigate the masses and call upon the "superior" element to save the party from its own folly. Some of these papers are owned bodily by favor-seeking corporations, and their editors are employed to chloroform their readers while the proprietors pick their pockets. Others are owned by men who are aristocratic rather than democratic in their sympathies and whose leanings toward plutocracy are due to a habit of mind or a perversion of heart, but whatever the reason, these papers do not represent the rank and file of the party and do not appreciate the party's opportunities or its obligations.

The democratic party is a people's party; it stands for government of the people, by the people and for the people. It demands that the government shall be administered in the interest of the people and by those whose sympathies are with the people and not with the exploiters.

The democratic party believes in observing the distinction between the state and the nation because the observance of such distinction is necessary to the protection of the rights of the people. The republicans cry "a revival of the doctrine of secession" wherever the democrats demand that the states shall be allowed to control their domestic affairs, but this is a false cry, and it will not deceive the country. The people of California got a lesson in states' rights when the president

intimated that their control over their school system could be regulated by a treaty, and the attorneys general of the various states got a lesson in states' rights when the federal courts began to suspend the laws passed by the states for dealing with state affairs.

But while the democratic party opposed the doctrine of some of the republican leaders that the states ought to be deprived of the power to regulate corporations, it also opposes the doctrine advanced by some of the corporation democrats who hide behind the doctrine of states' rights whenever federal legislation is proposed against monopolies. The democratic party believes in the exercise of the powers of the federal government as well as in the exercise of the powers of the several states. In other words, it believes that each government should act within its own sphere, but should act in the interest of the whole people.

On the trust question, on the tariff question, on imperialism, on the labor question—on EVERY question the democratic party insists that its policy shall be guided by the people and that the party shall act in the interest of the people. In all matters concerning the structure of government and the methods of government, the democratic party stands for the largest participation of the people in the control of their public affairs, state and national.

As the party believes in the right of the majority to dictate the policy of the government, so it believes in the right of the majority to control the policy of the party.

The representatives of plutocracy and of aristocracy speak contemptuously of the opinions of the people; Jefferson did not, and the democratic party prefers to follow Jefferson. The rank and file of the party furnish the votes, and in their hands is the destiny of the party. The primary system overthrows the boss and places the machinery of the party in the hands of the masses. This is as it ought to be, for the masses are brave when the politicians are timid, and the masses can tell what they want when the self-oppointed leaders misrepresent them or misinterpret their wishes.

The democratic party has a great opportunity at this

time. Have the federal courts trespassed upon the rights of the states? It is the people who suffer. Have our elections been corrupted and our politics debauched? It is the people who suffer. Have the monopolies stifled competition and plundered the public? It is the people who suffer. Has the United States senate become the rendezvous of the representatives of predatory wealth? It is the people who suffer and to the people we must look for relief through the election of senators by direct vote. Do high import duties tax the many for the benefit of the few? It is the people who suffer. Do the railroads extort an excessive rate to pay dividends upon watered stock? It is the people who suffer.

Every question, whether it concerns trade, taxation, transportation, labor or imperialism, presents the issue between the few and the many—between a government administered for the benefit of a class and a government administered for the benefit of the whole people.

The democratic party has no reason for existence unless it champions the cause of the people, and it can only do this when the voters control its policy. The people are honest, and they are intelligent enough to know the cause of their sufferings and to select the remedies.

The campaign of 1908 is approaching; the public is awake as seldom before. Economic problems are being studied as they were not studied until 1896—that was the beginning, and investigation has gone on with accelerated speed. The time has arrived to prepare for the coming campaign, and the planning must be by the democratic masses. No man or group of men can dictate a platform or nominate the candidates. The platform must be written by the voters, and the candidates must be selected by the voters, then we can have enthusiasm and hope of success. Each individual, whether he calls himself a leader or not, can propose but the decision must be made by the rank and file of the party.

Let the work begin; let the planks of the platform be hewn out and let the phraseology be discussed, so that when the conventions are ready to act, they can present the deliberate judgment of the people. The platform ought to be written at the primaries, not at the national convention; the national convention ought

merely to give expression to the calm judgment formed by the voters and inserted in the platforms of the various precincts, counties and states.

Each community has a right to instruct its delegates, for the delegate is the representative, not of himself alone, but of those who elect him. The voters have a right to instruct, and the representative is in duty bound to obey. And while it is generally safe to trust a man to obey instructions, even when he does not agree with them, it is better to select delegates who are in sympathy with the instructions. Those who distrust the intelligence of the people or have some plans which they are not willing to disclose to the people, sometimes oppose instructions, and say: "Let us select our best men and then let them consult." Sometimes these so-called best men have a private end to serve; sometimes they represent interests adverse to the interests of the people; sometimes they are more anxious to carry out their own wishes than to give expression to the wishes of those for whom they speak. It is best to instruct, and it is safest to put the instructions in the hands of those who agree with the voters as to what it is best to do. It is not possible, of course, to know what questions may arise in a convention, but if new questions arise, those who agree with the instructions given to them are likely to act in harmony with the wishes of the people who instruct them.

If the voters of each party dictate the platform and select the candidates, the contest will be an honest one and the victory will be acquiesced in. The democratic party has a better chance in such a contest than in any other kind, for it will enter the fight with enthusiasm among its members, and this enthusiasm will count for more than any campaign fund which it can collect. The country needs to have democratic principles applied to every department of the government in state and in nation. If the policy of the party is controlled by the voters of the party, the party will appeal not only to its own members but to those republicans who are convinced of the need of reforms and who despair of securing them through republican leaders.

Democratic principles are stronger than ever before. The president has endorsed four democratic doctrines—the regulation of railroads, the prosecution of the trusts, the income tax and arbitration, but the republican leaders have refused to follow him. What a strength it will be to us to quote the president in support of our doctrines while the republican leaders oppose them! When have we had such an advantage before? Secretary Taft goes a step further than the president does on the tariff question and gives us arguments which we can use in favor of tariff reform, and then he weakens on the proposition and asks to have tariff reform postponed until after the election for fear an early revision might hurt the republican party.

The attorneys general of the various states have endorsed another democratic doctrine, namely, the right of each state to control its domestic affairs, and this endorsement will strengthen our party's position.

What the party now needs is to prove to the people that it can be trusted to carry out the desired reforms, and this confidence can only be established by rooting out of the democratic organization every member whose business connections are such as to bias him in favor of the corporations which have been securing privileges and favors against the people.

With a platform which is really democratic, with candidates who really represent the platform, and with an organization that is really in sympathy with the platform and the candidates, the democratic party can enter upon a vigorous campaign with splendid prospects of success. Will the rank and file undertake the work and thus pave the way for a victory?

WHY LA FOLLETTE?

Former Congressman Martin, who will probably be the republican nominee in his congressional district, was interviewed recently by the Hot Springs, S. D., corre-

spondent for the Minneapolis Journal. Mr. Martin declared for Roosevelt first and for Taft second. In that same interview Mr. Martin called attention to an editorial printed in a republican newspaper of South Dakota in which editorial this sentence appeared: "In the state of South Dakota Mr. LaFollette is certain of a strong following in the republican party. The progressive faction now demanding the renomination of Mr. Roosevelt could easily turn from its favorite to the Wisconsin senator."

Then Mr. Martin said: "If there is the slightest danger that the republican support of South Dakota might be turned to the Wisconsin senator, it is time for the friends of the Roosevelt administration in the state to commence an active campaign for Roosevelt and Taft. I believe that Roosevelt-Taft clubs should be organized in every county in the state upon a platform of loyalty to the principles of the Roosevelt administration and for the purpose of securing the nomination of presidential delegates who will be for Roosevelt first and next for Taft, the president's choice."

Why is it so important that friends of Mr. Roosevelt, working "upon a platform of loyalty to the principles of the Roosevelt administration," exert themselves to prevent the nomination of Senator LaFollette?

The Wisconsin senator is admittedly the strongest champion among republican leaders of the reform policies, the advocacy of which has given Mr. Roosevelt his popularity.

If the Roosevelt policies are all they are represented to be it would seem that Senator LaFollette would be Mr. Roosevelt's first choice. It is true, however, that the Wisconsin senator is not on terms of intimacy with the White House. Indeed it is no secret that Mr. Roosevelt has a strong dislike for the Wisconsin senator; and now we are told by a distinguished representative of the Roosevelt-Taft forces that to avoid any possibility of LaFollette's nomination is a special duty for the Roosevelt-Taft element.

THE TRUSTEE

A New York pastor, according to the Columbus, Ohio, Press-Post, stated that several years ago when Mr. Rockefeller was asked why he did not retire from active business the oil magnate replied:

"I am the trustee of the property of others, through the providence of God, committed to my care. I am the steward of vast interests belonging in great part to widows and orphans and others who are actually, or relatively, poor. For this holding I am responsible to God. Were I to give up my interest in the Standard Oil company I would imperil the interests of these people, according to the popular supposition that my withdrawal would hurt the company's business. Therefore, I feel it my duty to God and to the people whose money is invested in my company, to continue active in its welfare."

Inasmuch as the public has to bear heavy burdens as a result of Standard Oil methods it is some consolation to learn that these things are done in accordance with Mr. Rockefeller's "duty to God and to the people." It is some consolation to learn that Mr. Rockefeller's accumulations are not the result of greed but were really committed to his tender care by divine decree.

Plainly Mr. Rockefeller imagines that the American people are as stupid within the sound of his preachments as they are patient within the feel of his impositions.

JOHNSON AND BURTON

The Philadelphia North American, an independent republican newspaper, pays a high tribute to Theodore Burton and Tom L. Johnson, and then frankly announces that under all existing circumstances Tom Johnson should be re-elected mayor of Cleveland. It says the only thing to be regretted about Johnson's re-election would be Burton's defeat. Granted that both are the best exemplars of civic cleanliness, does not wisdom and prudence dictate the choice of a man who has both

honesty and experience over the man who has equal honesty but absolutely no experience in municipal government? Of Mr. Burton the North American says:

"He abandons a brilliant career in congress because he believes it his duty to make Cleveland a republican city in local as well as national elections. He would have our hearty and unqualified hopes for success if his antagonist were almost any other man than the man he is."

Then the North American turns its attention to Mr. Johnson, and of him it says:

"We know Tom Johnson, too. We know him to be the best mayor ever chosen by an American municipality. We have heard this big, tireless, fearless Greatheart called a hypocrite, fanatic, demagogue and tyrant. We have learned that all such censure was inspired by the exploiters, the extortionists and the oppressors of the public. And we know that the lie is given to the accusations by all his actions."

That is high praise indeed: "The best mayor ever chosen by an American municipality." And after calmly looking over the situation from coast to coast the North American says:

"We should count the election of Theodore Burton in any other city a victory for the general good. Yet we should reckon the ousting of Tom Johnson from the mayoralty of Cleveland—even by Theodore Burton—as little short of a civic calamity."

That sums up the situation as it exists in Cleveland today. Theodore Burton, honest, able and energetic, but wholly without experience in municipal affairs, and Tom Johnson, honest, able and energetic and thoroughly familiar with municipal government in all its phases—"the best mayor ever chosen by an American municipality"—are opponents in the municipal campaign in Cleveland. One, unwittingly and unintentionally, perhaps, is the candidate of a political faction that puts partisan success above civic well being. The other the candidate of men of all parties who recognize in the purification of municipal politics the key to the solution of the problem of purifying and elevating national politics.

In view of all the circumstances should the result in Cleveland be in doubt? Is it possible that in the light of their past experiences the voters of Cleveland will fail to prefer the re-election of "the best mayor ever chosen by an American municipality?"

AFTER ASSET CURRENCY AGAIN

The financiers are planning to make another descent upon congress in the interest of asset currency. It will be remembered that at a meeting held after the last election the bankers' association formulated a plan and presented it to congress. But even when the election was over the republican congressmen were afraid to endorse this schme, and the bill was never brought before the house. An effort is being made to revive the scheme, but it will hardly meet a better fate at this time now that the presidential election is approaching.

Knowing that public sentiment is against an asset currency, the friends of this policy call it an emergency currency, and provide that a tax shall be imposed upon the issue so as to compel its retirement as soon as the emergency is over. This is a mere subterfuge. They aim to get a recognition of the asset currency principle, and then they can reduce the tax afterwards. The first result of the election of 1896 was the reduction of the tax upon national bank circulation. The banks insisted that they were issuing money for the accommodation of the public and that therefore they ought not to be taxed for it, and while the taxes were increased upon the general public by the Dingley act, the tax upon the banks was decreased. If they can now secure the right to issue an asset currency in an emergency, they will next insist that the tax should be reduced and then we will have the asset currency in its naked ugliness.

The fight must be made against the principle, and must be made now. An asset currency is dangerous, and its opponents will be able to invoke the very arguments which the financiers used in 1896 against silver. They professed to be very much alarmed lest the widow

and the orphan would suffer from a fifty cent dollar, and now they are advocating an asset currency under which a dollar will be put forth that has no intrinsic value at all and is only redeemable when the redeemer is solvent. While most of the banks or nearly all of them might redeem their notes, the fact that an occasional bank might fail to do so would cast a suspicion upon all asset currency because it would be impossible to tell in advance which bank would fail. We cannot afford to have such a currency in circulation. In the name of the widow and the orphan we protest; in the name of an honest dollar and a sound currency we indict this cheap dollar, this dishonest money. Labor must not be swindled by such legerdemain. The dollar in the hands of the toiler must not be subject to shrinkage when a cashier disappears or a bank president loans to himself upon worthless collateral. The national honor must be sustained, and the money of the country must be good all over the world.

Strange this reversal in the situation! The champions of an honest dollar now the defenders of a debased currency, and those who were charged with repudiation the champions of national integrity!

STRAWS

State railroad commissioners for northwestern states in session at St. Paul, Minn., expressed themselves in newspaper interviews against "absolute federal regulation."

Republican state convention for Nebraska held at Lincoln September 24 adopted this resolution: "We favor the enactment of a federal law and if necessary an amendment to the federal constitution which will forbid the federal courts from issuing writs of injunction against state officers charged by law with the enforcement of state statutes."

Attorneys general for twenty-three states in session at St. Louis adopted resolutions as follows:

Whereas, The efficient administration as well as the

preservation of our dual system of government requires that each sovereignty be permitted to exercise its function as defined by the federal constitution unhampered by the other; therefore be it

Resolved, By the convention of attorneys general of the several states here assembled that we earnestly recommend to the favorable consideration of the president and the congress of the United States the enactment of a federal law providing that no circuit court of the United States or any judge exercising powers of such circuit courts shall have jurisdiction in any case brought to restrain any officers of a state or any administrative board of a state from instituting in a state court any suit or other appropriate proceeding to enforce the laws of such state or to enforce any order, made by such administrative board, but allowing any person or corporation asserting in any such action in a state court any right arising under the constitution or any laws of the United States to have the decision of the highest court of such state reviewed by the supreme court of the United States as now provided by law.

We also recommend that suits in federal circuit courts by persons interested in corporations to restrain such corporations from obeying the laws of states in which they are doing business be prohibited.

State railroad commissioners in their national convention at Washington, October 11, adopted the following report:

The cases are rare where a railroad of any importance is not an interstate road. This may be argued as a reason for entire federal control, something we believe to be impossible without amending the constitution. This we do not think the states will concede until it is demonstrated that it is more practical than experience has yet shown it to be. There have been many general rate reductions in different states, followed by reductions in interstate tariffs, and so far as we know these have all been brought about by the affirmative action of state authorities. So far as we are advised, we know of no general reduction due to any action by the federal authorities. We believe that the best interests of the people would not be served by placing the entire respon-

sibility for rate regulation in the federal government. We believe there should be a much closer relationship between the federal and state authorities than seems to exist at present; that in many matters a state commission should act as agent for the interstate commerce commission to the advantage of both.

In his St. Louis speech Mr. Roosevelt said: "My plea is not to bring about a condition of centralization; it is that the government shall recognize a condition of centralization in a field where it already exists."

AN OBJECT LESSON

Have you heard from Virginia? If not you will be interested to know that the people are beginning to apply to politics the good old doctrine that no one can serve two masters.

For some twenty years a distinguished Virginian named Henry T. Wickham had been serving his district in the Virginia state senate. He came from an old family, stood high in society and had a large circle of personal friends. He was, however, general attorney for one of the large railway systems and by his political influence aided his road in matters before the legislature. At least this was charged and a fight was made against his renomination on this ground. The fight was started by Professor Dodd of Randolph and Macon college, who reviewed Mr. Wickham's record and charged that he served the railroads at the expense of his constituents.

The voters took the matter up and rallied about the standard of a retired naval officer who was brought out against the senator. At the primary the former naval officer won by a decisive majority and the railroad attorney can now devote his entire time to his client and the people of the district can have the undivided services of their senator. In another district the same question was raised against a candidate and the candidate resigned his position with the corporation.

Good for Virginia! Her people are entitled to the services of representatives who will represent them.

It is possible that a man may side with the people against a corporate client which pays him many times as much as he receives from the people—POSSIBLE, but not probable and it is not safe to take chances on the fidelity of such a man. As a rule, no man can serve two masters and a conscientious man will not try. It is time the democrats were investigating the records and business relations of the public officials and candidates who oppose efficient legislation. Virginia has set a good example. It is a valuable object lesson.

A VIRGINIA HINT

To those who pretend they fail to understand—and those who really do not understand—Mr. Bryan's answer to the question, "What is a democrat?" a citizen of Strasburg, Va., offers this hint: "It would seem that the man who cannot distinguish between one set of principles that would give justice and equal rights to all and another set that pretends to be for the public good but really conceals within their scope the deadly blight of special privilege is either uninformed or dishonest."

ANOTHER STRAW MAN

Whenever a republican wants to be sure of demolishing his opponent, he builds up a man of straw and then makes his attack with vigor. This is to be expected in those politicians who are more interested in their party's success than they are in the triumph of any principle, but it is a little disappointing to find the editor of a high class publication like the Outlook resorting to the "straw-man" method of fighting. In its issue of September 7 the Outlook has an editorial entitled "Inaction, Extirpation, Regulation," and in this editorial the editor outlines three distinct policies which, he says, "are proposed in relation to the railways and other great

corporations." Then he proceeds to describe the three policies as he sees them. He says that Judge Parker is the representative of the first, declaring "that this view is not based merely on a doctrine of states' rights is, moreover, evident from the fact that believers in the Parker doctrine, including Mr. Parker himself, are as ill disposed to commend the attempts of the states to control the railways and the corporations as to support the policy of the federal administration. All such attempts are, according to this view, to use a newspaper phrase, 'throwing bombs at capital and sapping the foundations of the financial and commercial structure.' This view is essentially critical, it is not constructive, because according to it, there is nothing to construct; whatever evils exist can best be remedied by a rest cure."

Judge Parker can say whether or not his position is correctly stated, and if misstated, he is in position to set himself right. President Roosevelt's position is discussed from the standpoint of a friend and an admirer. He is represented as favoring regulation. "According to this doctrine," says the Outlook editor, "of which the president is the most conspicuous advocate, agreements and combinations among railways and industrial corporations are, on the one hand, not essentially evil but, on the other, are not allowed to remain unchecked or uncontrolled—it is the business of the government so to regulate as to avert their real though incidental evils while preserving them as great agencies for civilization." Secretary Taft is represented as occupying the same position as President Roosevelt and as arguing for the same thing but answering different arguments from those answered by President Roosevelt.

In order to provide a golden mean for the president, the Outlook's editor puts Mr. Parker at one extreme and Mr. Bryan at the other. He says: "In contrast to this doctrine (Mr. Parker's), indeed at the very opposite extreme, is what we call the policy of extirpation. Of all the political leaders who advocate this policy, Mr. Bryan is still the most conspicuous." And then he proceeds to state Mr. Bryan's position as the editor of the Outlook sees it or would have others see it. He

thus describes it: "The formation of great railroad corporations, directing immense railway lines, he regards not as legitimate development but as a dangerous outgrowth; and huge combinations created for the manufacture and distribution of widely used products he regards not as beneficent industrial institutions, whose evils are incidental, but as essentially malignant concerns to be broken up or crushed. Anything that is favored by the railroads is bad for the people; anything that promotes the formation of great trusts is pernicious. Since then (the Madison Square Garden speech) Mr. Bryan has, in other terms, expressed not only his opposition to great corporations as such but also is displeased at any attempt to control them except by extermination."

In another part of the editorial the editor of the Outlook says: "And only last week in his paper, The Commoner, he declared that in urging a policy of federal regulation, 'the president yields to the entreaties of the railroads and that this policy is in the interests of the railroads and not of the people.' "

These quotations have been given to show how the editor of the Outlook either misunderstands Mr. Bryan's position or misrepresents it. Mr. Bryan has never objected to "the formation of great railway corporations;" he has never denounced such as "a dangerous outgrowth;" he has never described "huge combinations created for the manufacture and distribution of widely used products" as "essentially malignant concerns to be broken up or crushed." He has never said "anything that is favored by the railroads is necessarily bad for the people."

Let us take the railroad question first. Mr. Bryan is not only not opposed to federal regulation, but he advocated federal regulation for many years. It was in his platform in 1896 and 1900, and he favored federal regulation when a member of congress from March, 1891, to March, 1895. What he opposes is national incorporation and in opposing national incorporation he quoted from the president's speech to show that one of the reasons for national incorporation is to avoid state regulation. He said that national incorporation

was in the interest of the railroads and not in the interest of the people, and that in advocating national incorporation the president yielded to the entreaties of the railroads. Does anyone doubt that the railroads desire national incorporation? Does anyone doubt that railroads have been asking for it? Have the people asked for national incorporation of railroads? Has anybody, representing the people as a whole in any community or state, asked for national incorporation? A distinction must be drawn between federal regulation and national incorporation. There must be federal regulation; there ought not to be national incorporation. We have already had some federal regulation; we have not had, and are not likely to have, national incorporation. Has the editor of the Outlook overlooked this distinction? If so, his misrepresentation of Mr. Bryan's position is unintentional and ought to be corrected. If he has noticed this distinction, how can he explain the fact that he confuses the two and represents Mr. Bryan as opposing federal regulation and as criticising the president's attempts at federal regulation? Mr. Bryan has supported the president in his efforts at regulation and has insisted that he should go further. Mr. Bryan believes in more stringent federal regulation than the president has suggested, and much more stringent regulation than the republican leaders have consented to. He favors a law authorizing the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the present value of all the railroads—the republicans in the senate voted down this proposition last year, but the president has since that time advocated it. Mr. Bryan favors a law preventing the watering of stock or the issuing of fictitious capitalization. The president has advocated such a measure, but the republican leaders have not consented to it. Mr. Bryan further advocates a reduction in interstate rates until they only yield a reasonable return upon the present value of the road. The president has not advocated this, and the republican leaders in congress are not likely to consent to it. In the line of regulation Mr. Bryan advocates an act of congress compelling railroads to sell interstate tickets at a price not greater

than the sum of the local rates. Neither the president nor the republican leaders have advocated this.

These things in the line of federal regulation are mentioned to show that the editor of the Outlook misrepresents Mr. Bryan's position in putting him in the attitude of opposing federal regulation. It is national incorporation that Mr. Bryan opposes, and he opposes it because its object is not to secure federal regulation but to prevent state regulation. In so far as the president favors a federal regulation which will be added to state regulation, Mr. Bryan supports him. When he proposes to deprive the states of their power to regulate, as he does, through national incorporation, Mr. Bryan opposes him, for however well-meaning the president may be in adopting this Hamiltonian idea, he is doing what the railroads want done, and while it is not fair to say that "EVERYTHING that is favored by the railroads is bad for the people," it is fair to say that this thing favored by the railroads is bad for the people because it removes from the people of the state the power to control the railway traffic within their own borders.

The Outlook's editor also says that "Mr. Bryan hopes the time will come when the states and the nation will put the railway corporations out of existence, and will take their place as owners of railway lines and operators of railway trains." Mr. Bryan has expressed no such hope. He has simply said that his observation leads him to believe that the railway managers, by their abuse of private ownership, will compel the people to resort to government ownership as "an ultimate remedy." President Roosevelt has in two messages to congress warned the people that government ownership will follow unless the railroads consent to regulation, and Secretary Taft uttered the same threat in his Columbus speech. President Roosevelt and Secretary Taft expect the railroads to listen to the threat; Mr. Bryan does not. But Mr. Bryan is even more anxious for successful regulation than either the president or Secretary Taft. His anxiety began earlier and has had more time to grow. He will be more pleased than the president and the secretary if regulation can be made effect-

ive, but he has not the confidence that they have that the railroads will recognize the rights of the people to fair treatment. To show his interest in regulation Mr. Bryan has declared that ownership is not a present issue, and has pointed out what he regards as necessary to make regulation effective.

Now as to Mr. Bryan's position on the trust question. Mr. Bryan's objection to manufacturing and trading corporations does not turn upon their hugeness but upon the proportion of the total product which they control. He objects to the private monopoly for reasons which he has often stated. He defines a trust to be a corporation which controls a sufficient proportion of the total of any product to enable the corporation to approximately fix the price and the terms of sale. A huge corporation might not be able to control one business while a corporation of much less capital might absolutely control a smaller business. We should look at the extent of the control over the total product, not at the amount of the capital stock. The thing to be prevented is a private monopoly, and Mr. Bryan does want the private monopolies extirpated "root and branch," and he repeats what he said at New York that, "Those who are friends of private monopoly will insist on stringent regulation and then they will try to regulate the regulators and prevent the regulation from going into effect." Is not this what they have done? Did not the friends of private monopoly in the senate strangle an anti-monopoly bill drawn by the president's instructions and voted for by nearly every member of the house of representatives?

The editor of the Outlook should distinguish between industrial corporations which are large enough to take advantage of economies in production and those which are so large that they stifle competition and then have the people at their mercy. Secretary Taft says that there are good trusts and bad trust, but he may be playing upon the word trusts. Does he believe that there may be good industrial monopolies? If so, will he name one? The president does not say whether there can be good industrial monopolies or not. What does the editor of the Outlook think about it. Does he believe that

it is wise to allow any corporation to control ninety per cent of the total output of any article of merchandise, and thus be able to fix arbitrarily the price of the product and the terms upon which it shall be bought? If not ninety per cent, where would the editor of the Outlook place the limit? The Nebraska platform places the limit at fifty per cent, and declares that no corporation should be allowed to control more than fifty per cent of the total output. And in order to bring under federal control those corporations which aspire to a monopoly, the Nebraska platform favors applying the license system to every corporation that controls as much as twenty-five per cent of the total product. Is it extirpation to say that a corporation ought to be satisfied with forty million customers? If a corporation is allowed to control fifty per cent of a business, is that not sufficient? And is Mr. Bryan in favor of "extermination" because he is not willing that one corporation shall control more than that proportion?

Has the editor of the Outlook built up a man of straw because he prefers to attack men of straw, or has he misunderstood Mr. Bryan's position? That he may not misunderstand any longer, let that position be plainly stated. Mr. Bryan does not object to the private ownership of railroads, if under private ownership the railroads can be compelled to perform their duties as quasi public corporations. He favors regulation by both the state and the nation, the state to regulate domestic traffic and the nation to regulate interstate commerce. He believes that this regulation should be effective, and by effective he means that it should be so full, complete and stringent as to protect each individual and each community against discrimination and compel the railroads to carry individuals and freight at a reasonable rate; and this reasonable rate he believes to be a rate which will enable the railroads to keep their stock at par when they are honestly capitalized; and by honestly capitalized he means capitalized as all other businesses are, on the basis of the present value measured by the cost of reproduction. He not only believes in regulation, but believes that the power of the state is as complete over traffic within its borders as the power of

the nation is over interstate traffic, and he would preserve the dual form of government.

As to the trusts, he favors manufacturing and trading corporations and does not object to their size until they reach a point where they can destroy competition. Defining a trust as a monopoly, he denies that it is necessary to economic progress. He believes that competition should be protected and that private monopoly should be exterminated root and branch. Of course, in speaking of private monopolies he does not mean to include monopolies that rest upon a patent, for they are granted in return for a service rendered, and then only for a limited time. The monopoly in trade or manufacturing confers no benefit upon society and is wholly injurious.

To exterminate an existing monopoly does not mean the destruction of any business. It means the reduction of the business of that particular corporation by sale of branches until it ceases to be monopolistic in its proportions. To exterminate the monopoly root and branch is to reduce the size of those corporations which have become large enough to control the product, but this reduction, instead of injuring business, will increase business. After exterminating, by reduction, the monopolies now in existence, we should enact laws that will prevent the creation of monopolies in the future. Is there anything violent or revolutionary about this doctrine? It is simply legislating for the whole people, who are victims of monopolies, rather than for the few who are the beneficiaries of monopolies.

Now that the issue is stated, will the Outlook's editor state the position of his paper? Does it take the side of the people and favor the prevention of monopoly? Or does it take the side of the stockholder and insist that a monopoly should be permitted, leaving the people to struggle for its regulation afterwards?

EARNING THE TITLE

In his speech before the Philippine assembly Secretary Taft said that the policy of this government "must

logically result finally in ending the sovereignty of the United States unless both peoples agree to retain the bond owing to mutually beneficial trade relations."

In the same speech Mr. Taft said that he did not think the Filipinos would be fit for self-government for at least a generation.

In the opinion of Mr. Taft the American people must have tariff revision; but not now, not now. They must trust the republican party.

In the opinion of Mr. Taft the United States must withdraw from the Philippines, giving the people of those islands self-government; but not now, not now. The Filipinos must trust the republican party.

Surely Mr. Taft is proving his right to the title of "the Great Postponer."

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN FUNDS

The Houston (Texas) Post throws light on a bit of republican buncombe in this way: "It is announced from Washington that the republican congressional committee is preparing to set up a great campaign thunder factory at the federal capital for the purpose of conducting a long, persistent campaign for the control of the next congress and some people are wondering where the money is to come from, since it is not probable that the 'yellow dog' funds will be available. Don't be alarmed about the ability of the republicans to get money and plenty of it, and they will get it from the same old sources in the same old way. So far as this Washington bureau is concerned, however, it will be apparent later on that the public itself will pay the burden of the expenses. The approaching session of congress will witness a vast output of oratory. These speeches will be printed by the tens of thousands at a nominal cost and mailed to all sections of the country under the congressional frank. Thousands of tons of documents, prepared for campaign purposes, will thus go to the voters. The voter who gets this stuff, together with seeds, books, etc., may swell up when he thinks of

the courtesy of the congressman in thus remembering him, but it will not occur to him, perhaps that he is paying for it himself. All the preaching we have heard about civic righteousness will count for little when the exigencies of the campaign require money. The republican managers may not get it from Mr. Harriman or from the life insurance companies, but the protected barons are still interested in the Dingley law and they will have to pay the cost of its maintenance as usual. They know very well that the republican talk of tariff revision is buncombe and they will be prepared to do business with the campaign managers when money is needed. Of course, these contributions will not come directly from the treasuries of the trusts and corporations, but it is merely a matter of juggling the books to transfer the money to the hands of some individual who will hand it over. All the indications are that next year's contest will be fought between the people and the money power. The democrats will have less money than ever before and the republicans will have all they need for legitimate purposes and an abundance with which to buy voters in the doubtful states. The problem of getting the money is not troubling the republican managers in the slightest."

A GOOD EXAMPLE

The Springfield, Ohio, Trades and Labor Assembly sets a good example to similar bodies throughout the country. The assembly is made up of delegates from the various trades unions of the city affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Each year this delegate body manages a Labor Day celebration, and the proceeds are devoted to maintaining a free lecture course during the winter months. The lectures are upon economic questions of interest to workingmen and calculated to educate them along lines of higher citizenship. The Commoner commends this plan to the central trades unions of every city in the country and urges them to follow the example set by the enterprising and patriotic trades unionists of Springfield.

THE ASSET CURRENCY SCHEME

There is such a similarity between the editorials in the city dailies demanding an asset currency as to suggest that the editorials are written in response to a suggestion from the money centers. The big financiers have either brought on the present stringency to compel the government to authorize an asset currency or they have promptly taken advantage of the panic to urge the scheme which they have had in mind for years. Several years ago Secretary Shaw stated that we must either have a perpetual debt or the bank notes would have "some other basis." The "some other basis" referred to is the asset basis. When it became apparent that the public would not tolerate an asset currency the financiers asked for an emergency currency based on assets. This was only a subterfuge and the republican leaders were afraid to press it at the last session. Now it is to be brought forward as if it were a new remedy, just thought of as a panic cure. It is a panic breeder instead of a panacea; it would aggravate rather than relieve the situation. It would increase the bank's liabilities just at a time when depositors are fearful that the bank cannot meet present liabilities. The need of elasticity has been very much exaggerated; if banks would prepare in advance for "moving crops" and for such other future demands as may be reasonably expected they would not be confronted by so many "emergencies." The trouble is that they loan to the limit in ordinary times and therefore have no reserve available for the unusual demands. Another trouble is that the banks are encouraged to keep a large part of their reserve in reserve cities and therefore a shock in any of the big cities disturbs banking everywhere. Just now the country banks cannot use their reserves because the big city banks will not allow deposits to be withdrawn.

When the same money is counted over and over in the reserves of several banks the withdrawal of one thousand dollars results in shrinkage of several times that sum.

The democrats should be on their guard and resist

this concerted demand for an asset currency. It would simply increase Wall Street's control over the nation's finances and that control is tyrannical enough now. Such elasticity as is necessary should be controlled by the government and not by the banks. The government could furnish a certain amount of elasticity by increasing and decreasing government deposits according to the needs of business; or it could provide for the temporary issue of treasury notes on government bonds whenever a holder of bonds is willing to surrender the interest; or it could issue treasury notes in any emergency. But none of these plans will suit the financiers; they insist upon absolute control of the nation's finances—they to reap the advantage while the public bears the burden and takes the chances.

But the democrats in the senate and house are in duty bound to look at the question from the standpoint of the people, and oppose the asset currency in whatever form it may appear. They may also have to oppose the great central bank, which is a part of a scheme of the financiers. And they will find that the same influences which are behind the asset currency and the central bank are behind the president's plan for national incorporation of railroads. They are all a part of plutocracy's plan to increase its hold upon the government.

What we need just now is not an emergency currency but greater security for depositors. The depositors are scared—unnecessarily scared in most cases—but scared. The government is going to recommend a postal savings bank but according to press dispatches deposits will not be accepted in excess of two hundred and fifty dollars from any one person. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. All bank depositors should be made to feel secure and they could be made to feel secure by a guaranty fund raised by a small tax upon deposits. When depositors feel sure of their money they will not care to withdraw it and the money which would be drawn from hiding places would more than repay the banks for the small tax necessary.

The first thing is to release the public from the grip of Wall Street and then when the stock gamblers have

to suffer for their own sins instead of unloading them on the general public we may expect legislation in the interest of the people at large.

MR. BRYAN'S POSITION

A year ago last summer while in Europe, Mr. Bryan in an interview stated that it was too early to discuss the campaign of 1908 from a personal standpoint although during that summer the democratic conventions in something like half of the state of the union had passed resolutions complimentary to him and mentioned his name in connection with the democratic nomination for president. He has from time to time refused to discuss the availability either of himself or other candidates, believing that the party should have all the light possible before attempting a selection. A presidential candidate should fit the platform adopted by his party, and platforms are made to fit the conditions existing when the platform is made. No one can see very far ahead or speak with certainty as to the issues or as to the relative importance of issues in the campaign. Sometimes a day will change the situation, and a few months may bring forward a new issue which will have an important bearing upon the availability of a candidate. For this reason Mr. Bryan has refused to make any announcement as to his own position although he has from time to time discussed issues old and new. Now that the election of 1907 is past and plans are being made for next year's campaign he feels that a statement is due to the public. Those who prefer another candidate are entitled to know his position, and those who favor his nomination have a right to demand an answer to the question so often put—Will you accept a nomination? His refusal to answer the question has led to the circulation of many false reports, and unfriendly newspapers have taken advantage of his silence to misrepresent his attitude.

Mr. Bryan will not ask for or seek a nomination; and he will not assume to decide the question of his availa-

bility. He has been so amply recompensed by his party for what he has done and for what he has endeavored to do that he cannot claim a nomination as a reward; neither should his ambition be considered, for he has had honors enough from his party to satisfy any reasonable ambition. The only question that ought to weigh with the party is whether the party can be strengthened and aided more by his nomination than by the nomination of someone else. If he can serve the party by being its candidate, he will accept the commission and make the best fight he can. If, however, the choice falls upon another, he will not be disappointed or disgruntled. His availability is a question to be decided not by him, not by a few leaders, not even by the leading newspapers that call themselves democratic, but by the voters of the party, and to them he intrusts the decision of the question—they are the supreme court in all matters concerning candidates, as they are in all matters concerning the platform.

He assumes that they will not select him unless they desire to make an aggressive fight for the application of democratic principles to present conditions, and he also takes it for granted that the organization of the party will be in harmony with the platform and will be composed of men whose political records will invite confidence and give assurance that a victory, if won, will not be a barren victory.

It has been asserted that Mr. Bryan was waiting to see who the republican nominee would be. This is untrue. He has never felt that his position should be dependent upon the action taken by the republican party. The republicans must nominate either a reformer, a standpatter or one whose position on public questions is unknown, and the course of the democratic party should be the same no matter which element controls the republican convention. The democratic party must make its fight for what it believes. While it may take advantage of republican mistakes, it must depend upon its merits for success and not upon the errors of its opponents. If the republicans nominate a standpatter, the democrats can take advantage of the educational work that has been done by republican reformers; if

the republicans nominate a candidate who is believed to be favorable to reform, such a nomination will strengthen democratic doctrines, because republican reformers advocate the reforms that the democrats have advocated before them, and the democrats cannot afford to surrender their position because the republicans give a partial endorsement to a few democratic doctrines. If the republicans nominate one who straddles the issues and attempts to take both sides, it is none the less necessary for the democratic party to make an aggressive fight. The action of the republican convention may have its influence in the determining of the relative availability of democratic candidates, but it ought not to have any influence in determining the question whether the one chosen by the democrats should accept the nomination. If the rank and file of the democratic party desire Mr. Bryan to make the race, he will make it no matter who may be the republican nominee.

It has also been charged that Mr. Bryan was waiting to ascertain the chances of victory, ready to run if the outlook seemed bright or to refuse to run if the chances seemed unfavorable. This charge, like the other, is without foundation. No one can estimate the chances of the party in the next campaign with sufficient accuracy to make his candidacy dependent upon the outlook. While democrats have reason to be encouraged by the fact that democratic principles have grown in popularity and that democratic policies are now praised by many who denounced them a few years ago, and while further encouragement is to be derived from the fact that the democratic party is more united than it has been for many years, and the republican party more divided, still the action of the democratic party cannot be made dependent upon the prospect of success. The prospects now seem excellent, but a democratic national convention will be held, a platform adopted and candidates nominated whether the prospects are bright or gloomy, and the party must make the best fight it can whether it enters the campaign with fear or with confidence. Democrats believe that democratic principles are sound and that democratic policies are necessary; they should, therefore, endorse those principles and

present those policies and then select as their candidates those who, in their judgment, will give the party the greatest assurance of success in the campaign and the country the greatest assurance of benefit in case of victory.

No man can ask for a nomination as a compliment if his nomination will not benefit the party, and no democrat would be justified in refusing a nomination if his party demanded his services, and if the members of the party believe that Mr. Bryan's nomination will help the party, its principles and its policies, he will accept the nomination whether the indications point to defeat or victory. A defeat can bring no disgrace where the cause is a just one, but cowardice would be disgraceful, especially in one who is as deeply indebted to his party as Mr. Bryan is.

Just a word more. The next campaign will be an appeal to the public conscience. The investigations have shown not only the corrupt use of large campaign funds, but the only source from which they can be drawn, namely—the corporations that seek to convert the government into a business asset. The democratic party stands for the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none and therefore cannot promise favors to favor-seeking corporations. If it made such promises to the corporations, it would be guilty of duplicity, for it would have to betray the voters, as the republican party has done, in order to reward these corporations as the republican party has reward them. The democratic campaign must be carried on by volunteers who will work because they desire the triumph of democratic ideas. We cannot hope to appeal to the sordid or to buy the purchasable, even if such a course would contribute toward democratic success. No one should favor Mr. Bryan's nomination unless the party is willing to open its books and show where its contributions come from and for what the money is expended. The republican party ought to be challenged to conduct its campaign in this open and honest way and if the republican leaders refuse to accept the challenge, the democrats can well afford to leave the issue with the public. An appeal to conscience is politically expedient,

as well as morally right, for the conscience is the most potent force with which man deals. The national conscience has already been aroused, and a large majority of the voters have been educated to the necessity for real reform—a reform that will make this government again a government of the people, by the people and for the people. It only remains for the democratic party to convince the voters that it can be entrusted with the work of reform, and nothing will do more to convince the public than a refusal to negotiate with predatory wealth and an honest appeal by honest methods to the honest sentiment of the country.

TOM JOHNSON TRIUMPHANT

Hurrah for Tom Johnson! His victory was a notable one and one at which every democrat can rejoice. Mayor Johnson is making a brave fight for the people, and his triumph is their triumph as well as his. He is one of the few business men of the country who, having made a fortune, put a limit to his accumulations and placed his brain and business experience at the service of his people. He has had a hard fight—injunctions to the right of him, injunctions to the left of him, injunctions in front of him volleyed and thundered, but he fought on. Finally the administration—shame on it—entered the lists against him and urged Congressman Burton to oppose him. President Roosevelt drops several degrees as a reformer when he interests himself in the defeat of a man like Johnson, and Secretary Taft proves that he is no reformer at all when he joins the corporate forces allied against Johnson. Surely the voters of Cleveland can boast that they are incorruptible when they withstood the influences that were at work in favor of the street railways of that city. If republics are ever justly charged with ingratitude, it is because the people are ignorant of the service rendered by those to whom the public seems ungrateful. Where the people understand the situation, they can be trusted. They understood the situation in Cleve-

land, and Johnson's re-election is as creditable to the voters as it is complimentary to him. Hail Tom Johnson! May your tribe increase.

PUSHING ASSET CURRENCY

The New York World, which was so much disturbed at the suggestion that many of the great metropolitan papers were in league with predatory wealth, has joined the financiers in demanding that the banks shall be permitted to use their assets as a basis for currency. It says: "The responsibility for the lack of an elastic currency must be divided among Bryanites, bankers and western republican congressmen. The bankers have talked currency reform for years, but have never made a really united and aggressive campaign. The American Bankers' Association at its recent convention endorsed the credit currency bill reported by the Hepburn committee, but even then there was opposition from some of the western bankers. Mr. Bryan has fought currency reform for eleven years, and has succeeded in keeping the democratic party in opposition to it. To Mr. Bryan an inelastic currency is proof that the gold standard is wrong and that 16 to 1 is right. Hence there must be no reform."

It is doing Mr. Bryan too much honor when it credits him with "keeping the democratic party" from favoring an asset currency. It is true that Mr. Bryan opposes the asset currency, but he is not vain enough to assume that the almost universal opposition to it in the democratic party is due to anything he has said or done. Democrats oppose it naturally because they are opposed to turning the people over to the tender mercies of the masters of high finance. The World seeks to befog the issue when it attempts to connect the currency question with the silver question. There is no necessary connection between them. It would be as easy to maintain a bank currency under bimetallism as under the gold standard, and an asset currency would be as bad under a gold standard as under bimetallism. The

question of metallic money is one thing, the question of bank paper is an entirely different thing. There is no reason why a man should favor an asset currency merely because he favors the gold standard, and those who oppose an asset currency, do it without reference to their opinions on the silver question.

Neither does the question of elasticity have anything to do with the silver question. Not being able to defend the asset currency on its merits the World tries to convert it into a silver question and then attacks silver. The question of elasticity is not necessarily connected with the asset currency, for it is possible to secure elasticity without an asset currency. Mr. Bryan believes that the advantages of elasticity have been overestimated, but he also believes that it is possible to secure any elasticity which may be found necessary without resort to the perilous attempt to foist upon the country a currency resting upon the variable assets of the bank. The World shows its Wall Street bias when it speaks contemptuously of "prairie and sagebrush congressmen." Do not the congressmen of the west represent the sentiments of their people, and should they not represent their people, and are the people of the west less intelligent or less patriotic than those who read the New York World? The New York Tribune describes the members of the Oklahoma constitutional convention as "cornfield lawyers" and disparaged their work. Now the World has its fling at the "prairie and sagebrush congressmen."

The World's editorial not only betrays the weakness of the position the paper has taken, but it betrays the fact that the editor is conscious that he cannot meet the opponents of an asset currency in fair debate.

PROTECTING DEPOSITORS

The present situation has compelled study, and study has brought forth a number of remedies. Attention has already been called to the influence which stock gambling has had in producing the present panic, but

it is not sufficient to stop gambling. We ought, if possible, to devise legislation which will protect bank depositors not only from gambling on the stock market, but from other evils which may arise. The depositors can, by withdrawing they money, create a panic at any time no matter how prosperous the country is. Prosperity can be halted in a day by the withdrawal of deposits. In the reserve cities national banks are only required to keep twenty-five per cent of the deposits on hand, and in other cities only fifteen per cent. Banks could not afford to do business if they were required to keep all of the deposits on hand all the time. It costs money to handle deposits; an army of clerks is employed to keep the books, to take in money, to pay it out and to guard it. It is the loaning of the depositors' money that makes banks of deposit profitable or even possible. No matter how conservatively or safely a bank is managed, it is not in position to return all deposits on a moment's notice. In ordinary times the daily deposits will equal if not exceed the withdrawals, and if there are regular periods when more money is drawn out, the bank calculates on this and provides for it. Any solvent bank can be embarrassed if a run is made upon it. The other banks may come to its relief, but they cannot do so if a run is started on them at the same time. The important thing, therefore, is to prevent the depositors from making any sudden demand upon the banks, and how can this be done? By removing every possible reason for fear. It is fear that causes depositors to withdraw money and hide it. They do not want to take the risk of loss or robbery, but when a certain degree of fear is reached, they will risk keeping the money at home. Our banks are reasonably secure, but reasonable security is not sufficient for unreasonable people, and the unreasonable have it in their power to precipitate a panic.

The postmaster-general, according to the press dispatches, will recommend the establishment of a postal savings bank; this it is argued will draw a large sum of money from hiding, and this sum being deposited by the government in the various banks, will make the money available for loaning. It is said that many for-

eigners who are unacquainted with our financial system send to the savings banks of Europe money that ought to be deposited in the banks here. A postal savings bank will keep the money at home. John Wanamaker, a former postmaster-general and a business man of large experience, is quoted as placing the hoarded money at a very large sum—the larger the sum, the more the financial situation will be relieved by its deposit in banks.

But the postal savings bank as proposed will limit deposits, it is said, to two hundred and fifty dollars a year for one person. These banks will do a great deal of good, but they will not entirely relieve the situation. Our state and national banks should be made so good that no one will be afraid to deposit with them, and what is even more important, the banks should be made so secure that no one having a deposit will be tempted to withdraw it during a financial disturbance. How can this security be brought about?

A guaranty fund raised by a tax upon deposits and held for the protection of the depositors of any insolvent bank would give assurance to depositors. Panics always commence with a run upon one or a few banks which are brought under suspicion. If it were known that the depositors in such banks were sure of receiving their money, there would be no run, or if there was a run, the payment of depositors in full would relieve the strain and protect other banks. We ought to have such a guaranty fund in the nation and in each state. Our national banks should be protected by such a fund, and this fund can be provided for by an act of congress. As soon as the fund is sufficiently large, the tax should be suspended, and the very existence of the fund would tend to lessen the emergencies that might call for it. It would really cost the banks but little to provide the security which such a fund would furnish, and it is certain that the interest drawn upon the money brought from hiding would far more than compensate for the slight tax.

Each state should provide for such a fund for the protection of its state banks, and until national banks are protected by federal legislation, it would be well to

permit the national banks of any state to share in the raising of a guaranty fund and in the protection which it would afford. When this subject was brought up in congress several years ago, an objection was made to it on the ground that the large banks would have no advantage over the little ones if all were secure, but certainly this objection cannot have weight with depositors or with members of congress who desire to guard the interests of depositors, and at this time when the big banks have contributed so largely to the present stringency, that argument could not have any weight.

When it was attempted to secure such a fund by a legislative act in the state of Nebraska, the objection was made that it would injure national banks to have state banks made more secure by a guaranty fund, but if the national banks are permitted to share in the expense and benefits of such a fund, they could not reasonably object to it.

One of the lessons to be learned from the present financial crisis—and every evil ought to be turned to good account—is that additional security should be given to depositors, and The Commoner begs leave to submit to its readers throughout the country the plan above proposed for the securing of the depositors in both national and state banks. Where state legislatures are in session, it might be well to urge state relief at once, and the subject ought to be brought before congress upon its convening in December.

BE PATIENT, DEPOSITORS!

In other editorials The Commoner has pointed out certain remedies that ought to be invoked for the relieving of the present panic and the protection of the public for the future, but it begs to urge patience and confidence upon its readers. The banks are, as a rule, perfectly sound. They are not loaded up with bad paper. Examination will show that prices have been rising and that men are better able to pay their debts now than they were ten or even five years ago, but the de-

positors can precipitate a panic if they are unreasonable enough to do so. The withdrawal of a few dollars a day by each depositor, if he deposits none, will soon cripple the strongest institution, while an agreement among the depositors to exercise a little more faith will soon relieve the situation. While the local banks may find it impossible to withdraw the deposits which they have made in the eastern banks, those deposits will ultimately be paid, and there is practically no danger of loss to the various communities unless depositors are foolish enough to expect the impossible. When a depositor puts his money into a bank, he knows that his ability to withdraw it on demand depends entirely upon the probability that but few will want to withdraw the money at one time. He has no right to expect, therefore, that he can call for his money at once if all the other depositors do the same thing—still less should he expect it if his timidity makes others timid. This is a time when depositors should recognize the service of the bank to the community—for the bank would not exist but for the local demand for it—and the depositor should help to protect the community by giving such support as is within his power. The depositor who thinks only of himself at a time like this is as much to be criticised as the citizen who, thinking only of himself in time of war, refuses to bear any of the risks or dangers necessary for his country's protection.

AND THE NEW YORK HERALD SAID IT!

The suggestion made by the New York Herald, as given below, is in harmony with the suggestion made in The Commoner last week. Whatever expansion of currency that may be necessary ought to be supplied by the government and not by bank issue resting upon the assets of the bank. Bank notes are redeemable in greenbacks, and during the war, when gold and silver were at a premium, bank notes were redeemable by the

banks in greenbacks. There is no doubt about a government note, and a government note, besides being good, is legal tender. It is gratifying to find a New York paper like the Herald looking to the government instead of the banks for relief. Now if the Herald would advocate a guarantee fund for the protection of depositors, it would give its endorsement to a permanent form of relief from such panics as are due to the timidity of depositors. The Herald editorial above referred to reads as follows:

"It is a condition, not a theory, that confronts the country. It is now universally recognized that the cure for hoarding and contraction on the part of the public in a crisis is liberal and immediate expansion. This is what the Bank of England does when in emergencies the bank act is temporarily suspended and credit notes are issued to supply all demands.

"In the present crisis here the exigencies of the situation could be met by an issue of government legal tender notes to the amount of, say, $200,000,000, to be redeemed in a year or two, or perhaps convertible into government bonds within a stipulated period. The credit of the United States government is the highest on earth, and the notes thus issued to meet the emergency would be accepted as being 'good as gold.'

"Mere notice of such a measure might restore confidence and causing release of hoarded funds render their actual issue unnecessary."

HIGH FINANCE

To borrow money at three per cent and loan it to favored banks for nothing, that these banks may save the country by loaning the money out at a big rate—this may be high finance, but it will strike the average man as rather an expensive way of meeting an emergency. But it is Wall Street's way.

MONEY IN HIDING

The money in hoarding and hiding has been estimated at over one billion dollars. This not only reflects upon our bank management but enables us to estimate the enormous increase in the loanable capital that would come from a guaranteeing of banks which would draw this money into the bank and put it into the channels of trade.

NO BANKERS' TRUST

Some are advocating a guaranty of depositors by an association of banks, but this would make a bankers' trust that would soon run all other banks out of business. The government should be the guarantor and then it can admit to the system all banks that will comply with the conditions.

STOP THE GAMBLING

There seems to be no doubt that Wall Street speculation is the cause of the present financial panic, and this speculation is made possible by the fact that a large amount of fictitious and watered stock is issued. The small bankers throughout the country claim that their institutions are perfectly solvent, that their assets are good and that their only embarrassment is that they can not collect the money which they have deposited in eastern banks in the reserve cities. In suspending payments the bankers have done what they think is necessary for the protection of themselves and their depositors, and it is not fair to criticise them unless one has a better knowledge of the situation than they have; but somebody is to blame, and from the evidence at hand it would seem that the blame rests, first—with the speculators of New York who, in their desire to make money rapidly, have disregarded the interests of the rest of the country; second—with the New York banks and trust companies which have loaned money for speculation;

and third, with the republican party whose leaders have linked our whole financial system to Wall Street so that the people throughout the country are forced to suffer for the sins of the masters of high finance. It requires an object lesson to make people consider remedial legislation; abuses are never remedied until there is suffering, and the present panic ought to result in legislation which will give to the public a needed protection. Gambling is one of the curses of the present day—not merely the small gambling which is carried on in back alleys and obscure places, but the gambling which goes on in the chambers of commerce, the boards of trade and the stock exchanges. Purchases and sales of commodities and stocks when the sellers have nothing to sell and the purchasers have no intention of receiving the goods—thi may be called business, but it is nothing more nor less than gambling, and in some respects it is worse than gambling at the card table. First, it is on a larger scale than the gambling in the houses known as gambling houses; and second, the men who gamble on the markets sometimes control the markets and thus take an unfair advantage of those who enter into the game with them. It is time to stop gambling and one of the best ways to stop it is to stop the issue of watered stock and fictitious capitalization, for these are the cards with which the big gamblers play. A corporation whose stock rests upon actual value does not furnish much of an opportunity for exploitation. What the gambler wants is a stock whose value is uncertain, because then the market price can be juggled with. Just as a farm, whose value is to a certain extent fixed, does not furnish the same opportunity to the speculator as the mine whose value is undetermined, so the railroad stock that rests upon a value to be found in the road itself is not subject to fluctuation like the stock of a road whose dividends depend upon the ability of the manager to monopolize business. We ought to have legislation that will put our railroads and other industrial enterprises upon an honest basis, and then we ought to have legislation forbidding the use of national bank deposits to aid gambling. If the New York banks are to be allowed to receive deposits from country banks, such New York banks ought in all fairness be forbidden

to use country deposits to support speculative enterprises. All speculation is risky—if there were no risk in the matter, there would be no speculation about it, and the small banks of the country have a right to insist that their solvency shall not be jeopardized by the use of their deposits for gambling purposes. And if the bankers themselves do not insist upon this, their depositors ought to insist upon it, for while the local banker may be excused for refusing to honor checks in the present stringency, his depositors cannot be blamed if they denounce a system whereby the local bankers are driven into the net spread by New York financiers.

The republican party has been in almost uninterrupted possession of the federal government for forty-seven years. In its platform of 1904 that party boasted that with the exception of two years it had had control nearly all the time of two, if not three branches. As it requires a concurrence of the president, the senate and the house to enact a law or to repeal one, it is evident that the republican party is responsible for our present financial system. It follows without saying that the republican party is responsible for the present financial system and must bear the blame if the public is not sufficiently protected. Will the leaders of that party now take up the matter and legislate in the interests of the public or will they leave the country in the hands of the Wall Street financiers?

LET THE PEOPLE RULE.

Mr. Bryan has received a number of letters inviting him to assume the responsibility of naming a democratic candidate. Unfortunately the advice has not all been in the same direction, and the advisers do not agree as to the candidate to be named. Each one feels sure that Mr. Bryan can insure a party victory by declining to be a candidate, and urging the nomination of Mr. Blank. The advice is honestly given and well intended, but the advisers seem to overlook two facts. In the first place, the man who has the power to dictate the nomination of

a presidential candidate bears a great responsibility. If a majority of the democrats would agree to allow Mr. Bryan to name the candidate, they would hold him responsible for the success of the person named, and who is wise enough to assume intelligently such a responsibility? Who knows the sentiment of the individual voters well enough to say without a possibility of a mistake whether this man or that man will poll the most votes? It might be very pleasing to the friends of a particular candidate to have that candidate endorsed by Mr. Bryan if Mr. Bryan's endorsement insured the nomination, but Mr. Bryan's endorsement would not insure the nomination of the person endorsed, and it would not insure his election, and it would insure one thing, namely—that Mr. Bryan would be denounced as a dictator not only by all who are unfriendly but by many who are friendly. Is not President Roosevelt denounced as a dictator because he has indicated a preference for Secretary Taft? Do not many who call themselves Roosevelt men deny the right of the president to pick out his successor and eliminate other candidates? Is it likely that the men who for the last eleven years have lost no opportunity to find fault with Mr. Bryan would commend him if he picked out a candidate and demanded the nomination of that candidate?

The second objection to such a course is that it is not democratic. Power comes up from the people, not down from the leaders. In fact, a man according to the democratic theory is only a leader when he is going in the same direction that the people are going and a little ahead. He only leads when he is in sympathy with the people. All of this talk about the selection of candidates by the leaders, or what is no better, by a few metropolitan papers, is not only undemocratic but absurd. The rank and file of the democratic party are in no mood to have either Mr. Bryan or anyone else tell them what they ought to do. Any man can give advice, but the advice will be accepted upon its merits and not upon the authority of the one who gives it. Everyone has the right to propose a candidate, but it is for the voters to determine what candidate they want, and Mr. Bryan has neither the power to coerce the voters into the selection of any par-

ticular candidate nor has he the disposition to exercise such power even if such a power were his. All of the people know more than any of the people, and the six millions and more of democratic voters coming into contact with their neighbors can speak with more wisdom than any one person or any few persons can. Let the voters discuss the matter with their acquaintances and then let the sentiment of each community be expressed at the primaries and at the conventions, then the national convention will merely ratify the will of the voters, and the choice of the convention will be the choice of the whole party. With such a nomination the party can enter the campaign with a united front, and not having to spend any time in fights within the party, will be ready to charge the enemy as soon as the convention adjourns.

INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION

The New York World it at it again, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, is at it yet, for its misrepresentation is continuous, persistent and intentional. It gives a map of the United States showing the republican states in black and the democratic states in white, and it charges "Bryanism" with having turned the country over to the republican party. It, of course, ignores the fact that its element controlled the party in 1894 when the republicans won a more sweeping victory than they did in either 1896 or 1900. Mr. Bryan cannot be blamed for the republican victory of 1894.

And how about 1904? The World insisted on the nomination of a New York man and picked out the man, and it vociferously advised the candidate all through the campaign—and what was the result? The defeat of 1904 was much worse than the defeats of 1896 or 1900, yes, even worse than the defeat of 1894, and yet the World has the impudence to offer advice. It presumes to tell the democrats how to win! It does not compliment the intelligence of its readers when it misrepresents a situation which even they must understand.

GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION

Judge M. J. Moss, of Bell county, Ky., has issued an injunction in the Coleman Mining company case against Wash Spicer and others, which illustrates the extent to which the injunction can be carried. Spicer and several others whose names are given are "enjoined and restrained from interfering, meddling, advising, counseling any person from working in the mines of the Coleman Mining company, either by intimidation or force or any other interference or meddling with any person engaged or offering to engage in work in said mines, and by paying said persons to leave said mines, and by paying said persons to desist from work in said mines, by furnishing them food and rations for so desisting and that they be enjoined from giving it out and causing it to be printed in the papers or otherwise, that any miners are locked out of said mines, for ten days from this date."

It will be noticed that they are enjoined from meddling or advising. They are also enjoined from furnishing food and rations, from desisting from work and from giving out and causing it to be printed in the papers or otherwise that any miners are locked out of said mines. Is there any state in the union where a statute forbids the giving of food to a person as a means of influencing him? The judge in the above case assumed the right to declare unlawful a thing which has not been declared unlawful by statute, and having made this law, he proceeds to enforce it and then sits in judgment at the trial of the case, thus combining the legislature, the executive and the judicial powers in one. But bad as this is, it is made worse by the fact that a jury trial is denied to the one charged with belittling this judge-made law. The contempt, if there is any contempt, is of course committed outside of the presence of the court and must be established by proof. Instead of allowing a jury to weigh the evidence and determine the guilt of the one charged with contempt, the judge acts as both judge and jury. Is it strange that the laboring men should ask for legislation that will protect them in their right to call for a jury? Is it not strange rather that the public is so slow

to recognize the justice of the laboring man's request and the danger that lurks in the system of government by injunction?

1893 AND 1897

In his letter to Secretary Cortelyou commending the government issue of bonds Mr. Roosevelt said: "There is no analogy at all with the way things were in 1893. On November 30 of that year there was in the treasury but $161,000,000 in gold. On November 14 of this year there was $904,000,000 of gold. Ten years ago the circulation per capita was $23.23. It is now $33.23."

Mr. Roosevelt might have added that at this time when the government is issuing $50,000,000 in bonds it has something more than $250,000,000 loaned to the banks.

Mr. Cleveland had but $161,000,000 in gold and no money to loan to the banks but he was roundly denounced for his bond issue by republican papers.

Mr. Roosevelt has $904,000,000 in gold and $250,000,000 loaned to the banks, yet he makes a $50,000,000 bond issue in time of peace and men who condemned Cleveland applaud Roosevelt.

GUARANTEED BANKS

It is too early to say what the effect of the new bond issue will be, but the relief ought to come from other directions. The plans so far have been intended to furnish government money to the banks, whereas the most important thing now is to restore confidence in bank depositors, and thus not only prevent withdrawals, but secure deposits. While the banks are good and while the depositors are not justified in being frightened, some depositors are unreasonable and their excessive timidity may embarrass the banks. If the money that is being hidden and hoarded can be brought back into circulation the present stringency will disappear at once. It does

no good to supply money from the treasury if an equal or a greater amount is drawn out by depositors.

The administration is prepared, so we are informed, to recommend a postal savings bank. While this would doubtless encourage deposits and while those could in turn be handed over to the banks, it does not furnish complete relief. The plan as presented limits deposits to $250 for one person for one year, and does not contemplate the opening of checking accounts. The business community therefore can not use the postal savings bank to any great extent and besides it would take some time to inaugurate a postal savings system and secure the necessary number of employes to make the plan effective throughout the country. It is possible for the government to give immediate relief by an act of congress providing for the guarantee by the government of all deposits in national banks, the banks thus guaranteed to agree to reimburse the government for any losses incurred, and to make this reimbursement in proportion to their deposits. The advantage of this plan is:

First—That every depositor in such guaranteed banks will feel secure.

Second—The expense of it will be paid by the banks which get the benefit of it and this expense would be small compared with the benefit gained.

Third—It can be put into effect immediately and thus restore confidence, and enable business to be resumed.

It is probable that all of the national banks would be willing to take advantage of this guarantee, because the additional security given to their depositors would be of great advantage to the banks. During the past forty years the average annual loss to depositors has been small (less than one-tenth of one per cent on the deposits), so small that it would be an insignificant tax upon the $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 of deposits. The government would have ample security in the capital and surplus of the banks which would voluntarily join in the plan. As each bank would become interested in the proper management of every other guaranteed bank, it would be easier to secure the legislation necessary for the correction of such abuses as may exist and for the better management of the banks—for instance, legisla-

tion preventing over-borrowing by directors and officials of the bank and legislation preventing speculation by officials. The plan suggested ought to be acceptable to the depositors, all of whom desire security, and it ought to be acceptable to the bankers, who will be well paid by the increased deposits for any tax that may be collected from them to reimburse the government. What objection can be made to the use of the government as a guarantor when it is amply protected from loss?

The only objection that is likely to be made is that state banks might be less attractive to depositors if national banks are guaranteed, but there are two answers to this objection. In the first place, state banks are likely to suffer if this financial stringency continues, and they are therefore interested in restoring confidence. In the second place, there is no reason why state banks should not be protected by a similar system under which the state would guarantee depositors in state banks and collect the expenses from the state banks guaranteed.

Mr. Bryan proposed when in congress the raising of a guarantee fund for the protection of depositors, but the bill was defeated by the larger banks on the ground that the big banks would have no advantage over the little ones if all depositors were secured, but now that the big banks are suffering as much as the little ones the objection will hardly be made. The plan then proposed would furnish protection as far as the fund would furnish it, but it would take time to raise such a fund, and it is better for the government to make the security absolute by becoming guarantor, for this system can be put into operation at once and that, too, without expense to the government, inasmuch as the banks would reimburse the government from time to time in case the government was called upon to pay the deposits of any failed bank.

"WORKING TOGETHER"

In an editorial entitled "Working Together" the Wall Street Journal says: "For the first time in many months the administration and the leading financial interests of

the country are working together, or at least along parallel lines, for the restoration of business confidence. That there are still sharp and perhaps irreconcilable differences between them as to the many issues entering into the question of the control of interstate commerce goes without saying, but whereas for a long time they have been facing each other in angry contention, now they have apparently turned about, and stand together, shoulder to shoulder, to face a vaster problem and a more fearful peril than any involved in the corporation question—the problem and the danger of panic."

Mr. Roosevelt will have to keep an eye open while he and his whilom opponents are "working together." They will pat him on the back when he makes a bond issue, when he advocates pooling, when he favors the exclusive control by the federal government of railroads and they will throw their hats high in the air when he yields to their pleas and in his message to congress favors an emergency, alias asset, currency. And then they will turn upon their presidential comrade with the same readiness with which they seize an opportunity to oppress the people.

Better have a care, Mr. President! Better stand shoulder to shoulder with the people on all questions, even as you have done on some questions, than to trust yourself to the tender mercies of men who know no mercy in their mad chase for the dollar.

OPEN THE BOOKS

Referring to Mr. Bryan's suggestion concerning the publication of campaign funds the Sioux City (Ia.) Journal (rep.) says: "It is Mr. Bryan's purpose to challenge the republicans to meet him on the ground of publicity for campaign expenses, and the challenge ought to be accepted. Too much money of the wrong sort was gathered and expended for questionable purposes on both sides in the last national campaign. Both parties ought to be able to raise clean campaign funds and expend them in such a way that the light of publicity can

shine on all transactions. With our politics running largely to the demand for honesty in business, it is well to make sure of honesty in political campaigning."

It would be well if newspapers of all political parties spoke promptly upon this subject, thus creating a public sentiment which political managers dare not ignore.

TIME FOR ORGANIZATION

It is time to organize. Much time is lost after the national convention before members of the party can complete their organizations and get ready for work. There is no reason why this work should not be done at once, so that when the campaign opens the clubs can get to work immediately. In fact, much good could be done during the winter if we had our clubs already organized, for these clubs could hold open meetings and challenge republicans to discuss the abuses that need to be remedied, and the remedies proposed. The Commoner, therefore, urges the immediate organization of campaign clubs.

Democrats of every community should get together and form a club, and go to work for democratic principles. If they are united as to the platform that shall be adopted let them prepare the platform and urge its endorsement in their precincts and counties.

The nomination of a candidate should come from the voters, and the platform should be written by the voters. But the voters can do very little unless they are organized. Organization is necessary to secure success.

Let the work of organization begin; let the clubs be formed; let the candidates and platform be discussed. Then the voters will be prepared to instruct their delegates as to both candidate and platform.

The Commoner will be pleased to report the formation of clubs, and as far as possible it will present the various platforms suggested, in order that its readers throughout the country may know what is being said and done in the various sections. Now is the time to organize.

GRATITUDE!

Louis F. Post, editor of The Public, has a way of hitting the nail on the head. He never made a more certain strike in that direction than when he wrote: "These expressions of gratitude to Pierpont Morgan and John D. Rockefeller for throwing in their millions and 'saving the day,' are singularly disgusting specimens of toadyism. Thanks to the financial distress which is ruining its thousands, Mr. Morgan and the Standard Oil crowd have picked up control of a continental railroad, a big trust company, and the only great competitor of their steel trust. The suffering of others has made a harvest for them."

IT ALL DEPENDS

In criticising those who hoard their money in secret places, only to have it stolen, the New York Herald says: "A thief cannot negotiate a non-transferable dividend paying stock." It all depends on whether the thief is a mere porch climber or second story worker, or an eminent financier who plays the "Raffles" act from the inside.

THE THREAD TRUST

Buttressed behind a protective tariff that permitted the organization, the thread trust recently announced an increase in the price of thread amounting to more than twenty per cent. The trust did this, knowing from experience that the people were very patient, and also very thoughtless. They would not mind such a trifling thing as an advance of one cent a spool in thread prices. But to quiet clamor the thread trust advanced the plea that the price had to be increased on account of the increased price paid for labor and raw material. And now comes the announcement that the thread trust has declared a

dividend of thirty per cent. But what of it? The people will not seriously object to such a little thing as an advance of one cent a spool in the price of thread! Surely they will be willing to "let well enough alone."

GOVERNOR HASKELL'S PROMPT ACTION

A dispatch to the Oklahoma Oklahoman under date of Guthrie, Okla., November 16, tells this interesting story:

Learning that the Standard Oil company had all preparations made to construct a gas pipe line across the state line in Washington county in the interregnum occurring between the signing of the proclamation and the inauguration of state government, Governor Haskell privately qualified two hours before the public ceremony in order that his first official act might be to direct the county officials of Washington county to prevent the violation of the constitution if it were necessary to put every Standard Oil officer in the county jail.

Late last night Governor Haskell was advised that the oil company had the material on the ground and a large party of workmen camped near the state line north of Bartlesville, and that their intention was undoubtedly to try to take advantage of a lapse in government to push a pipe line across into Kansas.

He immediately communicated with the county officers elect of Washington county by telephone urging the county judge, the county attorney and the sheriff to cross to the Oklahoma side, qualify early in the day, secure an injunction preventing the construction of the pipe line, and summon a sufficient number of special deputies to enforce the injunction immediately. In the event that an attempt was made to violate the injunction, the sheriff was directed by the governor to arrest and confine in jail every man who tried to sink a spade in soil imminent to the Oklahoma state line.

At 6 o'clock tonight Governor Haskell received the following telegram from John Shea of Bartlesville, who was appointed as special deputy county attorney to apply for the injunction:

"Injunction issued this morning. Sheriff and large posse proceeded to scene of proposed line and found work completed to within two hundred feet of the state line. Injunction served immediately. Indian police ordered to co-operate with state officials and to turn all prisoners over to county authorities. Line patrolled all day. No more work done and no arrests made."

Previous to statehood, a gas pipe line could not be constructed across the state line because of inability to secure right of way over the Indian allotments. Under the state constitution the construction of such gas pipe lines across the state line is expressly forbidden. Could the Standard have succeeded in its ruse of this morning it would have given them an absolute monopoly in the exporting of gas from the state and would have allowed the piping to Kansas City, St. Louis or other outside cities the product of the strongest gas region of the state.

"I told the Standard Oil company and kindred monopolies before election that if they did not lick me at the polls I would lick them every day that I was governor until they decided to abide by the law," said Governor Haskell. "Today I have taken the first step in carrying out the promise I made to the Standard Oil company, as I took occasion several days before my inauguration to prevent the St. Louis Book company trust from unloading on the new counties of the state their accumulation of out-of-date and worthless books and blanks at an enormous price."

ABOLISH THE STOCK EXCHANGE TICKER

Former Judge A. J. Dittenhoefer in an article printed in the New York World says:

Now is the time to consider what measures should be taken to prevent the recurrence in the future of such financial debauchery as has prevailed within the last year or two. The root of the evil lies in the stock exchange ticker. Eradicate the root and to a large extent the evil will be eliminated. Every day of the year the

ticker is made to spread broadcast false and fictitious quotations of the value of the corporate securities held by the "high financiers" to enable them to unload on the outside public. They make fake sales, which are run off on the ticker as genuine, and the public, believing that the sales have actually been made, are fooled into purchasing them at the ticker prices. When the financiers have unloaded a sufficient quantity the prices are depressed by them in the same manner, to the great loss of the persons who bought them at the fictitious ticker prices, and then the financiers buy them back and unload them again, and so the endless chain is kept up. It is a regular bunco game.

Make it a felony to be a party directly or indirectly to the spreading over the ticker of such counterfeit transactions, and a stop will be put to such unconscionable watering of securities as has taken place within the last few years. If the financiers are not furnished with the facilities the ticker gives they will be unable to unload their wares on the public at fictitious prices, and there will consequently be no use or profit in their pouring streams of water into their schemes.

It may be answered that it may prove difficult to show by legal proof who the parties are who cause fictitious prices to be sent over the ticker, but whoever does this must have some confidential clerk in his employ who would be able to furnish this proof. That being so, is it likely that these men would be willing to place themselves in the power of their clerks and run the risk of an indictment for felony?

This principle applies to commercial transactions. If a person spreads, by means of a mercantile agency, a false statement of his financial condition, he becomes criminally liable and civilly responsible to any one who, on the faith of such statement, gives credit to the party making it.

MR. BRYAN AT THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

On the evening of November 26 at Washington City, Mr. Bryan was given a banquet by the "United Democ-

racy of the District of Columbia." District Commissioner H. L. West was introduced by Willis J. Abbot as toastmaster. Other speakers were Congressman Ollie James of Kentucky, Congressman Sulzer of New York, John Sharp Williams of Mississippi, and Mr. Hagan of New York.

Mr. Bryan's subject was "The Point of View," and his speech consisted of illustrations of the difference in the point of view from which questions are examined. Before taking up the serious presentation of this subject, he referred to some of the remarks made by preceding speakers and apropos of Mr. Hagan's suggestion that Tammany Tigers would make better playthings for children than Teddy Bears, he said that party emblems, as well as political toys, had their places and he spoke a word in defense of the democratic donkey. "The donkey," he said, "is really a better emblem than the elephant for a party. This was impressed upon my mind when I visited other countries. I found that the donkey is a resident of every country, and that everywhere he is serving the people and that, too, the common people. He is not an aristocrat. Whether you visit the mountains of the west, the densely populated regions of the Orient, the fertile valleys of the Nile, or the sacred soil of the Holy Land, you will find the donkey—patient, persistent and always at work. The elephant, on the contrary, is only to be found in certain latitudes, and is seldom seen except on dress parade. If greatness is to be measured by service, instead of by size or appearance, the position of honor must be given to the faithful donkey. As the democratic party is becoming a universal party and is everywhere justifying its claims to the confidence of the people by the service it is rendering them, it is entirely appropriate that it should prefer the donkey to the elephant as an emblem."

After dealing humorously with the charge that the republicans were stealing democratic thunder, he proceeded to point out the things which the president has borrowed, the democratic doctrines which he has ignored and the undemocratic doctrines which he has advanced, saying: "The president has advocated railroad regulation, which is a democratic doctrine, but he has not gone

as far as democrats would have him go, and the republican leaders are not willing to go as far as the president does. He has taken some steps toward the enforcement of the law against the trusts; in this respect he has been following democratic doctrine, although he has not prosecuted all the trusts and has not recently made any effort to secure additional anti-trust legislation. Here, too, the republican leaders do not support the president's position. The president has advocated an income tax; this is democratic, but none of the leaders of his party have yet attempted to carry out his recommendation on this subject and Secretary Taft, whom he has designated as his heir apparent, is not in favor of an income tax at this time. The president has also recommended arbitration as a means of settling labor disputes; this doctrine was taken bodily from the democratic platform, but it seems to be as unpopular with the republican leaders as other democratic doctrines.

"Here are four policies which the president has endorsed, which are distinctly democratic and which were being urged by the democratic party for from five to twelve years before the president ever said a word in their favor and it is a significant fact that these are the very things that have been giving him popularity. Surely no democrat will find fault with democratic policies which are so just and necessary that a president of the opposite party is forced to accept them.

"There are, however, several democratic doctrines which the president has not endorsed. He has not yet endorsed tariff reform, but the sentiment is growing so rapidly that Secretary Taft admits that tariff revision is necessary, although he yields to his habit of postponing and would put the reform off until after the election. The president has not endorsed the election of senators by direct vote of the people, although this democratic reform is so popular that the house of representatives has declared for it five times by a nearly unanimous vote. The president has not recognized the right of the Filipinos to the promise of ultimate independence, although the democratic position on this question has been vindicated by experience. He has not yet endorsed the democratic position on government by injunction, but in

his last message he intimated that it might become necessary to restrain the use of the writ of injunction if the abuse of this writ continued. He reminded me of the man who went to the theatre on a pass. The play was so unsatisfactory that the audience hissed and hooted, but the man with the pass kept quiet. Finally one of the audience asked him why he did not join in the expression of disapproval and he replied: 'I do not like this play any better than the rest of you do, but I am here on a pass. But if this play gets much worse I'll go out and buy a ticket and come back and then I will hiss with the rest of you.'

"Here are four democratic doctrines that he has not yet endorsed, and now let me call your attention to some very undemocratic doctrines which he has announced. In the first place he favors the national incorporation of railroads and other interstate commerce corporations, and this is in line with his position that the federal government can, through a treaty, interfere with the school system of California. The democrats insist upon the recognition of the right of the state to exercise its constitutional authority over its domestic affairs. He has recommended a ship subsidy which is so undemocratic that it had the solid opposition of the democratic party and the opposition of a number of republicans from the interior states. He has advocated an asset currency which is also undemocratic, and he has manifested a military spirit entirely out of harmony with democratic ideas and democratic ideals. Here are four positions taken by him which are undemocratic, and I may add that the republican leaders have supported him quite enthusiastically in all that was undemocratic and have opposed him quite persistently where he was democratic. I have been glad to commend the president where I could and have criticised him where it seemed necessary. If you ask me whether he is a democrat, I must answer that it would be unfair to him and unfair to the democratic party to call him a democrat. If you ask me if he is democratic, I answer after the manner of Peter Cartwright, the pioneer preacher of Illinois, who when asked if he was sanctified, replied, 'Yes, in spots.' The president is democratic in spots, and while the spots are not

as large as they ought to be, or as numerous as I might wish them, a democratic spot looks beautiful to me, no matter upon whom I see it.

"I am glad to note the growth of reform sentiment in the republican party, but the difference between the republican reformer and the republican standpatter is illustrated by a story which I recently heard. A man told me of a visit which he made when a boy to a backwoods neighborhood where the members of a certain sect still believed that the earth stood still. After several had expressed themselves on the subject one member was called on who had traveled enough to become skeptical on the question. Closing one eye and looking wise, he said: 'Well, she may move, but if she does she moves mighty little.' One of the others rebuked him, and said: 'You fool! She is either standing stock still, or she is going like blazes.' The republican reformer, having traveled a little and gathered inspiration from the democrats, is willing to admit that there ought to be a little reform, but the standpatter is quite sure that if we do not stand stock still, we will soon be going like blazes."

Mr. Bryan then took up his subject and proceeded to present the democratic view and the aristocratic view of government—Jefferson being the representative of those who view government from the standpoint of the whole people, and Hamilton representing those who view it from the standpoint of those who deny the right and the capacity of the people for self-government. He showed how this difference in the point of view accounted for the position taken by different people on questions relating to the methods of government. He insisted that the democratic party looked at government from the Jeffersonian point of view, while republican leaders were more Hamiltonian, and leaned toward centralization.

He next presented the democratic and aristocratic view of society, saying that the democrat regarded society as constructed from the bottom, while the aristocrat thought it constructed from the top. "The democrat," he said, "believes that if you will only legislate so that the people will be prosperous, their prosperity will be shared by the smaller classes that rest upon the people; the aristocrat believes that if you will only legislate to make the well-

to-do prosperous, their prosperity will leak through on those below. You cannot make a man admit that he is an aristocrat, but you can prove it on him by the view he takes of public questions. When I want to ascertain a man's point of view, I tell him the story of Lazarus and Dives. If he is a democrat he regrets that there is any one who is compelled to live on crumbs and begins to devise some remedy that will enable each one to have a table of his own and not be dependent on the crumbs that fall from the table of another. If he is an aristocrat, he says, 'What a lucky thing it was, Lazarus, that there was a Dives near.' This is no imaginary test. It is a very practical one. You will find that the democrat looks at public questions from the standpoint of the masses and asks what will be best for the people as a whole, while the republican leaders eulogize 'the captains of industry' and regard the employer as a sort of trustee to whom the government should give all that is intended for the employes.

"Why do republican leaders favor centralization? Because the great corporate interests want to get away from state legislation. The democrats believe that the government should be kept as near the people as possible and want federal remedies added to, not substituted for, state remedies.

"Why do the republican leaders prevent effective legislation against the trusts? Because they look at the question from the standpoint of the trust magnate, while the democrats look at the question from the standpoint of the millions who are victimized.

"Why do the republicans favor high tariff laws which tax eighty millions of the people for the benefit of a small fraction of the population? Because they look at the subject from the standpoint of the beneficiaries of protection, while the democrats consider the rights and interests of the consumers.

"Why do the republican leaders refuse to enact efficient laws for the regulation of the railroads? Because they look at the subject from the standpoint of the railway magnates, while the democrats consider the interests of the patrons and the interests of the stockholders, both

of whom have reason to complain of the management of some of our railway systems.

"Why is it that republican leaders oppose arbitration? Because they view the subject from the standpoint of a few big corporate employers while the democrats insist that the employes and the business public have a right to be considered. The same difference in viewpoint accounts for the difference in the position of the parties on the subject of government by injunction.

"Why is it that the republican leaders are willing to continue the enormous expense of imperialism when it has brought nothing but danger and humiliation? Because the republican leaders are considering the interests of a few who hope to secure Oriental trade, while the democratic party considers both the rights of the Filipinos and the interests of the democratic masses who pay the taxes and furnish the sons required for the military support of a colonial policy.

"And I may add, the difference in the point of view will explain the difference in the remedies proposed to relieve the present financial stringency. It came from speculation in Wall Street and the republican leaders have so tied the country to Wall Street that eighty millions of people must shiver when the Wall Street speculators get cold. The republican remedies all provide that the high financiers shall be well paid for acting as guardians, while democratic remedies look to the protection of the depositors and the business of the country.

"And so I might take up each question and explain the difference between the position of the two parties by the difference in the point of view, and this will also explain the difference in the attitude of the parties on the subject of campaign contributions. If it is said that the democratic party opposes the collection of campaign funds from corporations and individuals interested in class legislation because those contributions now go to the republican party, I reply that the democratic party could secure such contributions by promising payment in legislation or in immunity from punishment. But instead of doing that it prefers to protect our campaigns from the corrupting influence of such contributions by laws which will require the publication of contributions before the

elections. The time is ripe for a democratic appeal to the democratic sentiment of the country. There is no doubt that a large majority of the people take the democratic, rather than the aristocratic, view of government and of society. All that we have to do is to convince those who are really democratic in sentiment that the democratic party can be trusted to be democratic if entrusted with power. I believe that in the coming congress our democratic senators and representatives will prove themselves equal to the task imposed upon them and demonstrate the fidelity of the party to democratic principles. Then, with a united party we can face a divided opposition and enter the campaign with the assurance of a victory."

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The president's message contains a number of recommendations, the most important of which will be considered at this time.

National Incorporation.

He asks for "either a national incorporation act or a law licensing railway companies to engage in interstate commerce on certain conditions." There is a wide difference between "National incorporation" and a license. National incorporation is desired by the railroads in order to get rid of state regulation, while a license system properly limited would not interfere with state regulation. National incorporation would SUBSTITUTE a national remedy for a state one, while a license would simply ADD a national remedy to the state remedy. As a matter of fact, we do not need either national incorporation or a license system to control railroads. Congress already has plenary power to regulate interstate commerce, and congress can without either national incorporation or license authorize the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the value of the railroads, it can prevent the issue of watered stock and it can provide for the reduction of interstate rates. No new sys-

tems are needed to secure all the federal control of railroads that may be needed. So far as railroads are concerned the license system is unnecessary and national incorporation not only unnecessary but not to be thought of. It would be a gigantic step toward centralization and full of peril. The people should resolutely refuse to surrender the power now vested in the state to control commerce within its borders.

Monopolies.

The president suggests national charters or license for large interstate commerce corporations. He prefers national charters but would, as a second choice, favor licenses if national charters are not deemed advisable. Here again the two systems should be kept distinct. We do not need to charter interstate commerce corporations but we do need a license system which will prevent monopoly. The president has at last drawn the line at monopoly and in so doing has accepted the democratic position. In the democraticnational platform of 1900 the private monopoly was declared to be indefensible and intolerable and the license system was suggested as a remedy. In speaking of monopolies the president says: "No corporation or association of any kind should be permitted to engage in foreign or interstate commerce that is formed for the purpose of, or whose operations create, a monopoly or general control of the production, sale, or distribution of any one or more of the prime necessities of life or articles of general use and necessity. Such combinations are against public policy; they violate the common law; the doors of the courts are closed to those who are parties to them, and I believe the congress can close the channels of interstate commerce against them for its protection." This is exactly the democratic position and the democratic party can congratulate itself that another plank of its platform has been forced upon the party in power.

If a license is required of corporations desiring to control as much as twenty-five per cent of the total product and if the holder of the license is then prohibited from controlling more than fifty per cent, private monopolies

will be made impossible. The license should not interfere with the right of the state to control corporations doing business in the state but should add this remedy to state remedies.

The national charter, like national incorporation, is not only unnecessary but objectionable, because it would lessen the power of the state to protect its own people.

The president suggests several specific remedies, among others that "the real owners of a corporation should be compelled to do business in their own names." It would be well to apply this to newspapers so that the readers would know whether predatory interests controlled the paper.

"It is from every standpoint," says the president, "far preferable to punish the prime offender by imprisonment rather than to fine the corporation, with attendant damage to stockholders." This is another democratic doctrine appropriated.

The Currency.

The recommendation on currency is not very explicit, but his language would indicate oppositon to what is known as an asset currency. He says: "Such emergency issue must be based on ADEQUATE SECURITY, SECURITIES approved by the government, and must be issued under a heavy tax." This would indicate that he desires bonds of some kind to be deposited whereas the friends of an asset currency want the banks to issue on their general assets. While it is some relief to find that he has resisted the entreaties of the New York bankers to the extent of refusing to endorse the asset currency it is to be regretted that he did not declare himself in favor of the issue of treasury notes as an emergency—such notes to be issued to state as well as national banks on such bonds as may be considered safe.

The president's discussion of the tariff is disappointing. While he says that "there is an evident and constantly growing feeling among our people that the time is rapidly approaching when our system of revenue legislation must be revised," he qualifies his recommendation and postpones revision until after the election. In

fact, he really leaves it in doubt whether he wants revision after the NEXT election or simply after A presidential election. After endorsing the protective principle strongly he weakly suggests that it is "probably" well that "every dozen years OR SO the tariff laws should be carefully scrutinized," etc.

No wonder the standpatters are entirely satisfied with this part of the message—it means an indefinite postponement of tariff revision so far as the republican party is concerned.

The income tax and inheritance are endorsed, but they are to be considered not now but "when our tax laws are revised." Instead of attempting to prepare a new law which will avoid the objections raised to the last one by the supreme court it would be better to press an amendment to the constitution which will specially authorize an income tax.

Employers' Liability; Injunction.

The president very properly urges the extension of the principle of employers' liability and asks for the enforcement of the eight-hour day.

He comes a little nearer to the subject of government by injunction than he has heretofore, but does not yet take the matter up in earnest.

Campaign Contributions.

On the subject of campaign contributions the president says: "Under our form of government voting is not merely a right but a duty, and, moreover, a fundamental and necessary duty if a man is to be a good citizen. It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men. Moreover, no such law would hamper an unscrupulous man of un-

limited means from buying his own way into office. There is a very radical measure which would, I believe, work a substantial improvement in our system of conducting a campaign, although I am well aware that it will take some time for people so to familiarize themselves with such a proposal as to be willing to consider its adoption. The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties. An appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money. Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided."

The recommendation is given in full because it is a new idea and an important one. The Commoner is glad to bring it to the attention of its readers and to endorse it. Nothing would do more to stop corruption in politics and put the parties on an even footing in campaigns. The appropriation, however, should not be confined to the great parties. Having fixed the amount per voter the appropriation should be divided among all the parties in proportion to voting strength.

Arbitration.

The president renews his recommendation of arbitration, or compulsory investigation in cases of disputes between capital and labor. As this idea was in the democratic platforms of 1896, 1900 and 1904 the democrats ought to urge the establishment of such a board at once. He recommends that wood pulp be put upon the free list, but, probably to avoid the general tariff question, he justifies it on the ground that it will protect our forests.

Postal Savings Banks.

The president endorses the postal savings bank as recommended by the postmaster general. This is good

as far as it goes, but it would be better to supplement it with a system of guaranteed banks so that all deposits might be made secure.

The Territories.

The president will be commended for urging self-government for Alaska and full citizenship for Porto Rico. His recommendation of an appropriation for the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific exposition will also be approved as will his suggestion that the coast-wise shipping laws should be amended in the interest of Hawaii.

The Hermitage.

Democrats especially, and the public in general, will appreciate the compliment he pays Jackson in recommending an appropriation for keeping up and caring for the Hermitage, the home of Old Hickory.

The Army and Navy.

The president presents another defense of the army and the space devoted to it indicates that he recognizes that some explanation should be given of the fact that the minimum of the army has been more than doubled within ten years. He also makes a plea for a larger navy, supporting it with the empty arguments he so often advanced to prove that a big navy is in the interests of peace.

The Hague.

The president reports the progress made by The Hague tribunal. An agreement has been secured looking toward the elimination of navies as debt collecting agencies—at least until after award. But the president does not go far enough. While supporting The Hague court or commission our nation ought to proceed on its own initiative to promote peace by agreements with other nations stipulating that all questions in dispute shall be submitted to an impartial international tribunal for investigation before any declaration of war or commence-

ment of hostilities. Such agreements would do more to prevent war than any of the treaties yet made.

The president urges the encouragement of Chinese students to come to our colleges and in this he is wise. We ought to encourage students to come from all countries. We could afford to set apart a sum for the education of such students here, for friends thus secured would give us more protection than an equal amount spent on our army.

While there is nothing startling in the message it is probably his strongest state paper when measured by the number of subjects covered and the study required.

GUARANTEED DEPOSITS

The plan of the guaranteed bank is simply this. Statistics show the average loss to depositors to be very small, taking all the banks together. But the depositors are afraid because they do not know much about the affairs of any particular bank. The postmaster general, in recommending the postal savings banks, called attention to the fact that a large sum of money is sent back to the government banks of Europe by people who are afraid to trust the private banks here and Mr. Wanamaker has been quoted as saying that a large sum is kept in hoarding and hiding places in this country.

If this sum can be drawn into the banks and thus be put into channels of trade it will relieve the stringency more effectively than anything else. The postal bank will do this to a limited extent, but not completely, for in the plan proposed the depositors will be limited as to each person, and there will be no checking account allowed.

The system of the guaranteed banks contemplates the absolute guarantee by the government of such banks as may voluntarily enter into the system. In entering the system they agree to reimburse the government in proportion to their deposits for any losses incurred by the government in payment of depositors in failed banks. During the last forty years the average loss among na-

tional banks has been less than one-tenth of one per cent of deposits, and, as we have passed through two panics in that time, it is not likely that the average loss will be greater during the next forty years.

The government by its guarantee makes the bank deposits equivalent to government bonds, and yet it assumes no real risk because it has the capital, the stock, the surplus and the additional liability of the stockholders of the guaranteed banks as its security. The objection that is most frequently urged to this plan is that the state banks would suffer by competition.

This is a confession, first, that the depositor wants absolute security, and, second, that the state banks do not give absolute security. It would be hard to support a position that would put the interests of the state banks above the interests of the depositors.

But the answer to this argument is that the state ought to provide similar protection for depositors in such banks and until this can be done the state banks ought to be permitted to avail themselves of the national guarantee if they are willing to place themselves on the same basis in regard to inspection and security.

To sum up the situation, the depositors need security and this must either be given by the postal savings bank, which will grow until it has absorbed the deposit banking of the country, or it must be furnished through the guarantee of existing banks.

We believe it is better to give it as far as possible through existing banks than to have the government embark in the banking business on so large a scale as it would have to do if the postal savings banks were the only ones in which depositors would feel safe.

It is sometimes argued that the system of guaranteed banks would relieve bank officials of responsibility and make them careless in regard to the bank, but there is no truth in this, because the officials are chosen by the stockholders and the stockholders will lose everything before the associated banks will have to pay anything to depositors, and this loss to stockholders will in itself be sufficient to compel carefulness. When banks become liable for each other's losses it will make it easier to enact stringent laws for the regulation of banks—laws

for instance which will prevent directors from exploiting with the depositors' money, and laws that will prevent the officials and directors from gambling. These are the two sources through which defalcation generally comes, and it will be much easier to improve the management of banks when each bank feels an interest in the solvency of the other banks which are joined to it under the plan.

It is sometimes declared that the government has no more right to guarantee a bank than it has to guarantee the price of corn or cotton, but the fact is we have always recognized the distinction between money and other forms of property. We have usury laws regulating the rate of interest, but no law regulating rent; we have laws for the inspection of banks, but no law for the inspection of stores; we have laws limiting the amount of money that can be loaned by a bank to one borrower, but no law limiting the amount a merchant can buy or sell. Money is the life-blood of commerce and the present stringency shows how easily an unreasonable fear on the part of depositors may paralyze business.

We do not know what the senators and congressmen may think of the plan, but we believe it is the duty of every citizen to propose what he thinks is best and give his reasons and then leave the people and their representatives to sit in judgment upon the plan. Some plan must be adopted and we know of no other that is so effective, or which can be put into operation as quickly. The government is not going beyond its legitimate bounds under the strictest construction of the constitution when without cost or risk to the treasury it restores confidence throughout the country, putting the expense upon the banks which will get the benefit of the increased deposits.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Roosevelt's suggestion that the government appropriate money for the legitimate expenses of political parties is original and is entitled to serious consid-

eration. The appropriation might be justified on the same ground that we defend the printing of ballots in payment of primary expenses by the government. A few years ago we had to raise money by subscription to print our ballots, now they are printed at the expense of the public.

In some places the cost of the primaries is still borne by the candidates, while in other places it is paid by the county, city or state. The public is interested in having a campaign so conducted that the issues shall be presented clearly and voters fully informed. There is no doubt that the republican party has been able to secure enormous campaign funds by selling legislation in advance to special interests. If the government should appropriate a reasonable amount for campaign expenses and then apportion that appropriation between the parties according to the vote cast at the last general election, it would enable all parties to present their policies and thus insure more intelligent action on the part of voters.

The president's recommendation ought to be taken up and discussed in all sections of the country. It ought to be, as we have no doubt it will be, ultimately enacted into law. If to this is added a provision forbidding private contributions, the law will go far toward the elimination of corruption in politics, for when the government furnishes the necessary funds it will require a strict accounting of the money spent.

In an article printed seven months ago in the Reader Magazine Mr. Bryan said:

"It is not sufficient to prevent contributions from corporations, for where there is a great temptation to aid in campaigns, the officers will find ways of contributing that will not bring the corporation within the letter of the law. It is necessary that the contributions of individuals shall be made public where those contributions are to any considerable amount, and it is also necessary that the publication shall be made in advance of the election in order that the voter may know what influences are at work in the campaign. One of the Washington correspondents has reported the president as considering a law which will provide all the parties

with necessary campaign funds to be paid out of the public treasury. I do not know whether this statement is authoritative, but it is a suggestion worthy of consideration. If each party was furnished with a moderate campaign fund in proportion to the votes which it cast at the preceding election, and then all other contributions were prohibited by law, corruption in politics might be reduced to a minimum. And why should not the reasonable and necessary expenses of a campaign be paid by the public, if the campaign is carried on in the interest of the public? At present, in any controversy between predatory wealth and the masses of the people, the corporations which are seeking special privileges and favors are able to furnish enormous campaign funds to the party subservient to them, and no one can doubt that these campaign funds are furnished upon an understanding, expressed or implied, that they shall be allowed to reimburse themselves out of the pockets of the people."

THE BENNETT FOUNTAIN

The following is a report of the speeches made at the dedication of the Bennett fountain at New Haven, Conn., November 29, 1907. The audience was estimated at ten thousand, and prominent citizens occupied seats upon the platform. Mayor Studley introduced Mr. Blake, chairman of the park board, who said:

Mr. Bryan:—The late Philo S. Bennett by his last will and testament, among numerous other philanthropic bequests gave "to the park commission of the city of New Haven the sum of $10,000 to be expended by them in the erection of a drinking fountain at the southeast corner of New Haven green to be known as the Bennett Fountain." In April, 1905, you as his executor, paid over that bequest to the park commission increased by $181.78 accrued interest, but diminished by $800 legacy taxes in the states of New York and Connecticut; the sum actually paid being $9,381.78.

The park commissioners believing that Mr. Bennett intended to have $10,000 expended on the fountain invested the sum received in interest bearing securities until it should accumulate to that amount. One year ago that result was attained and the commissioners thereupon after considering several designs for the fountain which had been offered selected the one prepared by Prof. John F. Weir, an artist of distinction and head of the art school of Yale university, and contracted with him to erect the fountain at a cost equal to the amount of the fund. Since then Professor Weir has devoted himself to the work with extreme interest and assiduity and the result is the beautiful structure which you see before you.

The design is based on the celebrated monument to Lysicrates, which was erected in Athens about 335 B. C., and which still stands, regarded by all connoisseurs as one of the most tasteful and pleasing productions of ancient Greek art. Some changes from the original have been made by Professor Weir in order to adapt the structure to its use as a public fountain, but these have not impaired its classic grace and have distinctly enhanced its beauty.

The material is Vermont marble carefully selected with reference to its weather resisting qualities and massively combined for indefinite durabilty. The work has been to Professor Weir one of love and pride and public spirit, and it is due to him to add that he has so far exceeded the requirements of his contract that he has entirely sacrified his own pecuniary compensation.

The duty imposed upon the New Haven park commissioners having now been accomplished it has only remained for them to make this report of their doings to you as Mr. Bennett's executor and now to place in your charge the completed structure to be disposed of according to his well known purpose.

May it stand as long as its Athenian prototype; a beautiful ornament to the city of New Haven; a blessing to countless millions, and an appropriate memorial to the overflowing beneficence of its donor.

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH

Mr. Bryan, after formally turning over the fountain to the mayor, said:

I appreciate the honor done me by the mayor of the city and the park commission in inviting me to deliver the address at the dedication of the fountain presented to this city by the late Philo Sherman Bennett.

While my position as executor of his last will and testament makes it not inappropriate that I should participate on this occasion, intimate acquaintance enables me to draw some lesson from his career.

He was a typical business man; I may say even more, he was an ideal business man. His life work represented not only what is necessary to business success, but what is best in a business life.

The adornment of a city is a work in which the public-spirited citizens can play a large part. The city by taxation paves its streets, erects its public buildings and provides for those things that are a necessary part of the city's life, but there is a zone outside of the necessary things in which may be placed the things that are desirable and the furnishing of things desirable—things that will beautify the city and add to the comfort and convenience of the people—affords to the individual an opportunity to give enduring form to his taste and to express his good will.

Public gifts imply in the giver the ability to give and the disposition to give, and Philo Sherman Bennett combined these two essentials.

Beginning life a poor boy he journeyed slowly but surely toward financial independence, exemplifying those traits of character and those habits which are not only necessary to success, but which can scarcely fail to win success.

He was of distinguished ancestry, a descendant of Governor Eaton and related by blood to the great family which has given its name to your university. In his veins ran the blood of the Shermans and the Bennetts and yet so modest was he that I doubt if his most intimate friends ever heard him speak of the illustrious names connected with his family tree.

He recognized that ancestral greatness could not supply him with the necessaries of life or relieve him from the duty of being himself one of the world's toilers.

Yes, he began life a poor boy, but poverty is not always a disadvantage, if, in fact, it is a disadvantage at all. A few years ago a group of prominent business men were relating their experiences, and one after another told how he had commenced with a few dollars and made a fortune by his own efforts. Finally it came the turn of the last of the group and he said: "I have had a harder time than any of you. I was born rich and in spite of that fact I have made a success in life," and there was truth in the remark.

My father once expressed to me a similar opinion when he said that there were two ends to the horn and that if one commenced at the small end he might come out at the large end, but that if he commenced at the large end he was quite likely to come out at the small end.

Poverty furnishes a discipline which can scarcely be found in any other condition—not a poverty which makes one destitute, but a poverty which furnishes a stimulance and spur to endeavor.

Mr. Bennett was industrious. "Seest thou a man diligent in business? He shall stand before kings," said Solomon, and the years that have passed since he spoke have not altered the rule.

No one can hope to make progress in any sphere of activity who does not apply himself patiently, persistently and laboriously to his work.

Mr. Bennett learned integrity when he was young and throughout his life his sense of honor and his honesty were conspicuous in all his acts.

Mr. Bennett possessed another virtue—self-denial. He was able to sacrifice the indulgence of today that he might enjoy the amount saved and the accumulated interest at a future day. Without self-denial accumulation is impossible. No one can make more than he can spend. He can only lay up for the future by resolving to spend less than he makes no matter how small his income, and this self-denial was not for himself alone, but for others also.

Only those can expect security in old age, who place a limit upon their expenditures in earlier years, and only those can hope to give to others who are willing to deny themselves.

Thus advancing from office boy and errand boy to salesman, and then to proprietorship, he secured for himself an independent fortune, for while $300,000 may seem a mere pittance to those who gamble on the stock exchange, it was sufficient for all his needs and might well be sufficient to satisfy the desires of anyone.

Invested in two per cent government bonds his fortune would have given him $6,000 income, more than senators and congressmen received until recently and more than most of our governors now receive. Invested at five per cent it would have brought him $15,000 —more than cabinet officers and supreme court judges receive.

It was enough for him and all that he wanted. Society is interested in the independence of the citizen—society can afford to encourage that economy which is necessary to place the individual beyond the possibility of want for the man who saves not only relieves the state from a possible tax for his support, but furnishes an example that is useful to the young.

But Mr. Bennett had more than the ability to give, he had the disposition to be generous. Many have made larger fortunes and at the end found their hearts shrivelled rather than enlarged by their possession. We have had some notable examples of those who have spent upon themselves far more than Mr. Bennett ever made and others who have lived in the midst of crying needs and yet been deaf to all entreaty.

The fact that Mr. Bennett desired to share his fortune with others was due to three causes. First, he led a simple life; second, he recognized his obligation to society; third, his sympathies were broad enough to take in all mankind.

His tastes were not expensive. He did not weaken his body with high priced foods; he did not waste his wealth on costly apparel and he did not find it necessary to spend all his time in aimless travel to vary the dull monotony of a selfish life.

He and his wife traveled the road together, enlarging their expenditures as their means increased, but never indulging in the habits or dissipations that are sometimes found among the well-to-do. He was fortunate in choosing in his youth a helpmate who assisted him in his plans and who shared his ideas of life.

He was conscious that while he was a self-made man in the sense in which that term is generally used he was indebted to others even more than himself. From his parents he inherited physical strength and mental endowment, from the environment of his youth and his associates in early life he received the ideals which in his after years he attempted to realize.

His sympathies were large. His wealth never separated him from the struggling masses. He considered himself a part of the multitude even when he became a prosperous merchant. The recollection of his early struggles made him interested in the struggles of others.

He left $30,000—one-tenth of his fortune—to the cause of education; $10,000 was distributed among twenty-five colleges and in each one of these colleges an annual prize for the best essay on the science of government stimulates students to examine into the fundamental principles of our form of government.

What better testimony could he have given of his endearing interest in American institutions? Ten thousand dollars more was distributed among other colleges and in each some man will be assisted to secure an education. The remaining $10,000 of the educational fund was distributed among girls' schools. In each one of these some worthy girl will each year be assisted to higher education. As may be seen from the report filed in the probate court, in nearly every state and territory in this union some boy or girl will be placed under obligation to Philo Sherman Bennett for assistance rendered in an hour of need.

If it is impossible to measure the influence of one kind act or even of one kind word upon the destiny of the human race, what historian of the future can chronicle the large service that our friend has rendered to the world.

To perpetuate one's name by noble deeds is a laudable ambition and no one will begrudge Mr. Bennett the pleasure found in the contemplation of the bequests which would manifest his love of New Haven and his interest in the various causes which appealed to him. While life's largest influence is to be measured by that impression which the heart makes upon the hearts with which it comes into contact, it is pardonable if one hopes that his name will be remembered when his body has turned to dust, for the name recalls the person and his virtues.

In youth we have a mistaken idea of life. So much is done for us that it is not surprising that we should give little thought to our duty to others. But as we approach the boundary of life, "where we lay our burden down," we think less of what has been done for us and more of what we can do for others. Then the honors and the riches of the world diminish in importance and we inquire what impression we are making upon the world—what we are doing that will in a permanent way identify us with humanity. Then we begin to find consolation in the hope that those who knew us best will feel that the world has gained by our lives and lost by our death.

Mayor Studley said:

Mr. Bryan, I thank you for the heartfelt tribute you have paid to the memory of Philo Sherman Bennett. He was respected and beloved by all who knew him. In behalf of the city of New Haven I accept this memorial fountain and assure you that our citizens will prize and guard is as one of their choicest treasures.

A thing of beauty is a joy forever. * * * it will never pass into nothingness.

This beautiful fountain shall always be a joy and a comfort to our people and the memory of him who gave it shall be as lasting as its classic and artistic walls of solid marble.

Its limpid waters as they pour forth to quench the thirst of weary thousands, not only of the present, but also of the countless generations to come, shall ever seem to plead with eloquence the cause of sobriety, humanity and patriotism, so dear to Mr. Bennett through-

out his life, and shall always seem to say of him, "He loved his fellowmen."

Sir, in behalf of the municipal government and of all our people again I thank you.

REGULATION WILL BE EASIER

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican says: "Mr. Bryan's plan of a government guaranty of national bank deposits, to be supported by the banks themselves, is receiving a good deal of favorable comment from western papers, quite regardless of party. It is being urged, for example, that under such a policy the failure or suspension of the large bank at Kansas City would not have happened, since there would then have been no such extended withdrawal of deposits as had taken place on the circulation of dubious rumors. If the government should ever adopt such a plan, then in justice to the soundly-managed banks, which would be taxed to protect depositors in other banks, it would have to deal with the speculative institutions a little more effectively than hereofore."

Yes, and it will be easier to get effective regulation when there is joint liability. Now the good banks are opposed to necessary regulation because they think they do not need it.

CAMPAIGN EXPENSES

If the people paid the campaign expenses they would get more attention from the officials elected. For forty years the republican party has been bartering away legislation and immunity in return for campaign contributions and the people have had to foot the bills. It is cheaper to pay campaign expenses by direct appropriation than to pay through bad laws and lax administration.

PECUNIARY

It must strike the Christians of Germany as somewhat remarkable that the kaiser should give only pecuniary reason to support his peace policy. He does not oppose conquest on the ground that it would be morally wrong but only on the ground that it would not pay. On this low ground, however, as well as on higher ground, we can oppose all forms of colonialism.

CHRISTMAS

Again we are approaching the Christmas season, and the hearts of the young and the old are made merry by the joys and festivities that throng the holidays. To the child it means toys, sweetmeats and the pleasures of vacation. To the older ones it brings that renewal of youth that comes from contact with the buoyancy of youth. The children, not yet acquainted with the joys of giving, are overflowing with happiness because of what they have received while their parents, measuring life by a higher standard, find a deep satisfaction in the joy that they impart.

Let not the circle of kinship bound the generosity that the season prompts, for it is not a small gift that gave to Christmas its significance, and to the Christian world this day so faithfully observed. He in whose honor the Christmas tree is reared gave the full measure of a life, and the spirit that ascended from Calvary has entered into the life of many millions, and that spirit has given to those lives a fullness that they would not otherwise have known. If the world's indebtedness to the precepts of the Man of Galilee measures the bounty to be scattered on the coming Christmas morn, the world will be filled with gifts and gratitude.

The Commoner bids its readers a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

PROMINENT MENTION

Any person desiring advertisement can secure it. Now is the time when anyone can secure the title of prominent democrat by sending in an interview to a republican paper saying that he has always voted the democratic ticket but does not believe that the democrats can win this year. Fortunately, however, such interviews are more than offset by the republicans who confess that neither side in the republican party can hope to win.

WHY NOT TEST THEM?

The republican party is in power in the White House, in the senate and in the house, but the division in the party is rapidly growing. The standpatter wants nothing done; the reformer is anxious to make at least a showing of progress; the president has recommended several things that the democrats have been contending for for years. Why not test the republican party and find out how many Roosevelt men there are in the senate and house? If the democratic minority will take up the different propositions upon which our party has a record and to which the president has given approval and put the full strength of the party behind these propositions, it is possible that some of them may be forced through. At least it is possible to show that the republican party does not support the president when his recommendations are democratic. In the next campaign the republican party will attempt to carry water on both shoulders; it will endeavor to so write its platform as to hold the reform republicans without alienating the standpatters. Why not expose this attempt in advance by compelling the republican party to go on record in the present congress for or against the president's recommendations? For instance, the president recommends publicity as to campaign funds, and even suggests that the expense of the national campaign shall be paid out of the federal treasury. While the latter recommendation has never been endorsed by the demo-

cratic party, it is entirely democratic. The people as a whole are interested in having the issues fairly and fully presented; for years the republican party has sold legislation to the highest bidder, and by putting itself under obligations to predatory wealth has rendered itself impotent to protect the people. The small amount which would be appropriated to cover the legitimate expenses of the campaign would be insignificant compared with the amount that the people have year after year been forced to pay to the favor-seeking corporations that have been supplying the republican party with the sinews of war. Why not hold a democratic caucus and prepare a bill appropriating a sum equal to ten, twenty or twenty-five cents for each voter, the amount to be divided between the national parties according to the vote last polled? Then let individual contributions be prohibited, or if permitted at all, not later than ten or fifteen days prior to the election, and then only on condition that all sums over a minimum of say twenty-five dollars be at once made public by the contributor. If the democratic party presents such a measure, the republican majority will have to accept it or go on record as opposing the president's recommendation.

The republican leaders ought to be compelled to consider the trust question also. The president has made recommendations on this subject which ought to be brought before congress but which will not be brought before congress by the republican leaders. For the first time the president has drawn the line at monopolies—and this is the point at which the democratic party has for years drawn the line. Democrats do not oppose production on a large scale, but they do oppose private monopoly. They are in favor of enforcing the criminal law against trusts and trust magnates, and in their platform of 1900 the democratic party proposed the very license system to which the president now gives an alternative endorsement. He favors the charter of interstate corporations, but he says that "if a corporation law is not deemed advisable" a license act for big interstate corporations might be enacted. He insists, and that rightfully, that "congress can close the channels of interstate commerce" against private monopo-

lies. Let the republican party be put to the test on this proposition, for surely no democrat will reject today a position which the democratic party announced more than seven years ago. Sentiment has been growing against the trusts all these years, and the democrat who has not yet reached the position which the democratic party announced in 1900 is lagging behind the army.

A federal license for big corporations could not be invoked against a state; it would simply be permission from the federal government to enter interstate commerce upon such terms as the various states might prescribe. If for instance the democratic party proposes a measure requiring a license to be taken out by corporations desiring to control as much as twenty-five per cent of the total product, such measure will be in harmony with the democratic platforms of 1900 and 1904, and in harmony also with the president's recommendation. If the measure also provides that no licensee shall be permitted to control more than fifty per cent of the total product, it will make a private monopoly impossible, and by withdrawing the interstate use of the railroads, the mails and the telegraph lines from any corporation which, being required to take out a license, refuses to do so, it can confine the corporation to the state of its origin and thus protect the public. Such a measure is thoroughly democratic, and yet the republicans cannot oppose it without opposing the president.

The president admits the necessity for tariff reform, although he does so in language less forcible and direct than he usually employs. He says that no tariff legislation should be attempted until after the next election, but there are many republicans who differ from him on this proposition, and the democrats ought to give these tariff reform republicans a chance to express themselves. The democratic party is united on the tariff question, and it requires the vote of only about twenty-eight republicans acting with the democrats to pass a measure through the house. Are there twenty-eight tariff reform republicans in the house? The question can be tested by a caucus measure putting upon the free list imports that come into direct competition with

trust-controlled products. For instance, the democrats might prepare a measure providing for the free importation of articles which come into direct competition with articles fifty per cent of the total consumption of which is controlled by one corporation or combination of corporations. Such a measure would enforce itself and every importer would be watching for combinations in restraint of trade. If it is impossible to get enough republicans to favor a measure putting the limit of control at fifty per cent, they should be tested upon a measure fixing the maximum control at sixty, seventy and seventy-five per cent. If they are not willing to use the free list to prevent any monopoly however complete, they will be on the defensive in the next campaign. Similar measures can be brought forward free-listing particular articles or reducing the tariff upon the necessaries of life or fixing a maximum tariff. Congressman Williams, of Mississippi, introduced such a measure in the last congress but it ought to be re-introduced and urged by a party caucus. The republican tariff reformer should be given a chance to express himself, and if he refuses to express himself, he will be compelled to explain his position when he comes before his constituents.

It might be well to present a resolution amending the constitution so as to specifically authorize the levy and collection of an income tax whenever congress shall deem such a tax expedient. The president has recommended an income tax, and the democratic party stands for an income tax. The income tax measure would be objected to by some on the ground that it would be held unconstitutional, but a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing an income tax would bring the fight on the principle rather than on details and would enable us to find out how many republicans are really in favor of the principle involved in an income tax.

The president asks that the interstate commerce commission be authorized to ascertain the present value of the railroads whenever it deems the matter important. Would it not be well for the democratic caucus to prepare and present a measure authorizing and instructing the interstate commission to ascertain the

value of the railroads? If the republicans refuse to support a measure authorizing the commission to ascertain the value of all the railroads, let another measure be framed in exact accordance with the president's recommendation authorizing the commission "to make a physical valuation of any railroad whenever in its judgment it is necessary." The republican party must either accept such a measure or confess its opposition to the president's recommendation. In recommending the enlargement of the scope of the interstate commerce commission the president has simply followed the democratic platform, and the democratic party ought not to hesitate to urge the fulfillment of a doctrine set forth in the democratic platforms of 1896, 1900 and 1904.

The president recommends that the interstate commerce commission shall be given power "to pass upon the future issue of securities" of railroad companies. This is not only democratic but it is eminently just, and now while the people are smarting over the effects of vast issues of watered stock, public attention should be drawn to the subject, and the republican leaders should be forced to accept the president's recommendation or reject it. The republican leaders will not take the initiative in these matters because the republican leaders take their inspiration from the great corporations, but they can be put upon the defensive if the democratic party by united action forces them to take a position.

The railroad managers would be glad to get national incorporation of railroads, but this the democratic party can and ought to oppose to the very end. We do not need national incorporation; the constitutional power of congress regulating interstate commerce is ample. National incorporation is not desired by the railroads in the interest of better regulation but as a means of avoiding state regulation, and the democratic party will not for a moment countenance any surrender of the power that the state now has to protect its own people in all matters relating to commerce within the state even when that commerce is carried on by a railroad that runs through several states.

On the subject of arbitration the democratic party

should in caucus advocate a measure which provides a board of arbitration, the findings of the board not to be binding upon either party but to be a guide to public opinion and a means of conciliation between labor and capital. If this board contains five members say, and then two members are added in each dispute, one to be selected by each side, both sides will be insured a fair hearing, and the chances are that a full investigation will lead to an amicable settlement of differences and thus protect the public from the inconveniences of a strike, the employes from the hardships involved in a strike and the employers from the bitterness and ill will that often accompany a strike. If the democrats will present such a measure—and such a measure is in harmony with the democratic platforms of 1896, 1900 and 1904—the republicans have to accept the measure or place themselves on record as opposed to the president's recommendation.

On the subject of government by injunction the democrats can also make use of the president's recommendation and compel the republican leaders to consent to the necessary legislation or confess their opposition to it. This test could be made by the introduction of a caucus measure giving to the accused in contempt cases the right of trial by jury when the contempt complained of is not committed in the presence of the court and must be established by evidence.

The same test can be made in the matter of the eight hour day and in other matters relating to the welfare of the laboring man.

The president intimates in his message that the suspension of state laws by injunctions issued by federal judges has been carried too far. This also gives the democrats an opportunity to force action by the republicans upon a very important question. This can be done by a caucus measure which will expressly deny to circuit and district judges of the United States courts the right to suspend state laws, leaving those laws to be passed upon first by the state courts with the right of appeal to the United States supreme court if any constitutional right is denied to the corporations. Surely the corporations which do business in a state and

rely upon the state courts for the condemnation of land and for the protection of their property from criminal acts ought to be compelled to give the state courts the benefit of the presumption and test their rights in these state courts first before their appeal to the federal courts.

Now is the time for the democratic party to lay down the lines of the coming campaign. The president's recommendations have given the democrats their opportunity. If the republicans are willing to go as far as the president has gone, several democratic measures will be enacted by the present congress. If on the contrary the republican leaders refuse to follow the president's recommendations, the breach between the president and his party will be shown and the differences of opinion emphasized.

Besides urging the democratic measures which the president has wholly or partially endorsed, the democrats should also force a vote upon the popular election of United States senators. That measure has already been endorsed five times by the house of representatives but the senate has five times obstructed the passage of the necessary resolution. Let the matter be brought up again and let the republican senators be put on record that their constituents may be able to identify them in the senatorial elections which are near at hand. The president has as yet failed to endorse the election of sentors by the people, probably because he takes the Hamiltonian rather than the Jeffersonian view of government, but among the rank and file of the republican party this is the most popular reform now before the country, and the democrats should insist upon a vote. The republicans of the house do not dare to oppose it, and the opposition of the republican senators ought to be exposed.

The democrats have a great opportunity. Will they improve it?

MINORITY LEADERS CHOSEN

The democrats of the senate have chosen Senator Charles A. Culberson as the chairman of their caucus,

which makes him the leader of the senate during this congress. It was a wise choice, for Senator Culberson is well equipped for the position. After a large experience in his own state, ending with his election as governor, he entered the United States senate and has from the first taken a prominent part in the shaping of legislation. He is a skillful debater as well as a sagacious counselor, and the minority in the senate is likely to make the most of its opportunities under his leadership.

Hon. John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, has been again chosen a minority leader of the house, and no one disputes his great ability. He is a skillful parliamentarian and an eloquent and forceful speaker. While there have been differences of opinion among members of the minority upon various measures that have been proposed, there seems to be a disposition to unite and force a vote upon the questions about which the party is united, and Mr. Williams, with the solid democratic vote behind him, will be able to do effective work in the advancement of democratic policies. The democratic senators and members realize that the prospects of victory can be very much increased by wise action during the present session, and The Commoner will be glad to co-operate with the democrats of the senate and house in presenting to the country the issues formulated in congress.

THE PRESIDENT REITERATES DECLINATION

The president has cleared the political atmosphere by reiterating his determination not to be a candidate for a third term. It ought not to have been necessary to speak again, but some of his over-zealous friends were casting reflections upon his good faith by announcing that he would be a candidate if his party demanded it. The president could hardly feel complimented at so light an estimate being placed upon his declaration, and it is just as well that he set the matter at rest. There is no doubt that some of his enemies were declaring for him in order to get into the convention, and once there, could have thrown their influence against his

policies after his refusal to be a candidate. Now the fight will be a straightout one between the republican reformer and the standpatter. That is, it will be as straightout a fight as can be made for such a reformer as Secretary Taft has proven himself to be—a very weak one at best. If the president threw his strength to Senator LaFollette, who stands for aggressive reforms, it would be a pretty fight, but the president probably feels that very little reform can be hoped for from republican leaders, and he therefore selects Secretary Taft as the reformer who will excite the least opposition among the representatives of predatory wealth.

While the democrats will be glad to know of the president's fixed purpose not to be a candidate, their opposition to his candidacy was not on account of his popularity, for it is not at all certain that he could have polled more votes than any other republican, but President Roosevelt's candidacy would make it impossible for the democrats to secure the support of Roosevelt republicans. The natural fight is between the democratic party and the reactionary element of the republican party, for in such a fight the democrats can take advantage of the educational work that President Roosevelt has done, and the issue ought not to be in doubt. Senator LaFollette would poll the radical strength of the republican party but would lose even more than President Roosevelt would among the standpatters. Secretary Taft will, if nominated, straddle the issues and seek to hold the two wings of the republican party together. He cannot hope to hold all the radicals that the president would hold or LaFollette would hold. Neither would he alienate as many of the standpatters. With him as a candidate the aim of the democrats would be to show that he does not stand for any reforms worth mentioning, and that his administration, if in line with his utterances thus far, would be colorless.

It is fortunate that the third term issue is removed from politics, for it would have distracted attention and prevented a consideration of the economic reforms about which the country is now thinking. That the president has acted wisely no sincere friend of his will deny, for he has nothing to gain by another term and

a defeat would be disastrous. Those who have insisted upon his nomination in spite of his declaration have thought more of the party than they have of the president, and it is not certain either that they accurately gauge public opinion, for the anti-third term sentiment is a real sentiment and one not to be lightly considered.

SECRETARY TAFT'S MOTHER

The readers of The Commoner will regret to learn of the death of the mother of Secretary Taft. Beneath all party differences there is a humn nature that links us all together, and the questions that divide us in campaigns are forgotten when death enters the household. Mr. Taft hesitated about his departure because of his mother's sickness, and he has hurried as rapidly as he could in the hope of reaching her bedside before the last summons came. The news has been borne to him, and he will return carrying a burden of sorrow which all of his countrymen will share in so far as one can share such a burden with another. Mrs. Taft's death at this time will be regretted the more if her son reaches the coveted honor of a nomination, for what mother does not rejoice in her son's success? The whole country was glad that President McKinley's mother survived his election and was present at his inauguration; for Mr. McKinley, life too, was made radiant by the domestic virtues which are everywhere prized.

THE KAISER'S POLICY

Following will be found a very frank statement of the kaiser's policy. He says:

"Germany's future development imperatively requires a powerful navy. We must export the product of our industries and new and wider markets are constantly necessary to us. As much of our trade must be with semi-civilized countries—with people to whom

a nation's physical strength is the test of its commercial greatness—we must show that we are strong. A mighty navy will add millions to the volume of our trade. We must develop our colonies. To do this we need a greater navy. Germany did not become a colonizing power until the best countries for such development had already been annexed by other nations. We had no choice but to be contented with the best of what was left. Yet our colonies may become, through German energy and perseverance, of incalculable worth. We must not be like children, however, who put a bean in the ground and return the next day to see if the plant has grown. Colonies are necessary to our ever increasing population. Without them we must lose millions of our people to countries which can better accommodate our overflow. There are no countries in Europe we could conquer and add to our possessions without danger to ourselves. Denmark, Sweden and Norway are poor and undesirable. The Netherlands shows much of the old Germanic strength and tenacity, making political national assimilation difficult. This is true of Belgium to a still greater extent. Switzerland is the best buffer state we could wish. It is true the Baltic provinces were once German, but their Russification is making great progress daily. We are mistaken if we think we would be received there with open arms. Even if we could conquer them, they would become a permanent difficulty to us. The extension of our eastern frontier would put us in a more unfavorable strategic position than at present, besides making of Russia an irreconcilable foe. We should never, indeed, think of such a conquest. We need Russia and Russia needs us. We do not want anything from England and England cannot take or even wish to take anything from us. England and Germany have every reason for helping one another, so long as our vital interests do not conflict. We have, in fact, every reason for wishing England's strength to increase. We would ourselves feel any weakening in its power. All we could expect from England even in the event of war, in which we won, would be some small and undesirable colony. Any German statesman who would fight England on such a pre-

text would not deserve a place at the empire's helm. All Germany wants is peace, and again peace, development of our commerce and industries and a constantly widening national culture."

The kaiser justifies his demand for a large navy on the ground that Germany wants colonies. He is consistent; if he is going out to conquer and exploit the half civilized races he will need a large navy. But if we are not going to burglarize why must we supply ouselves with a kit of burglar's tools? That is the way one democrat has expressed it and it is an apt expression. We are not contemplating a raid and have not, therefore, the reason that Germany has for wanting a big navy. Our isolated position gives us a national protection which no navy could supply. Why join in the mad rush for naval supremacy?

KENTUCKY

The republicans who are trying to extract satisfaction out of the result in Kentucky should examine the vote. They will find that the democratic vote was thirty-two thousand less than it was in 1903 and that the republican vote was six thousand less than it was that year. In other words, about thirty-eight thousand voters staid at home—not to speak of the natural increase in the vote. The republican candidate for governor was elected, and the republicans, though not securing control of the legislature, made gains. This, however, was not due to an actual increase in the republican vote or even to the popularity of the republican candidate, for he actually received fewer votes than the republican candidate of four years ago. The trouble was that the liquor question hurt the democratic party in the cities while factional fights within the party hurt it in the country. Much as the result is to be deplored, there is no reason to doubt that the democratic party will carry the state by a large majority in the presidential campaign of 1908, for all of the factions are united on national policies. Kentucky will be in the democratic column as sure as election day comes.

OPENING THE CAMPAIGN

The campaign of 1908 is already opening, although the convention is some six months off. The first banquet after the announcement of Mr. Bryan's willingness to be a candidate, if the democratic voters desired it, was held at LaFayette, Ind. Eight hundred men sat at the tables and some three thousand men and women occupied the galleries. Nearly all the leaders of the Indiana democracy were present, a number of them taking part in the program. The belief was everywhere expressed that Indiana would be found in the democratic column in 1908.

On November 26 the United Democracy of Washington held a banquet at the Raleigh hotel, where more than five hundred were seated at the tables and as many more were unable to obtain tickets owing to the limited capacity of the dining room. It was said to have been the most successful political banquet ever held in Washington, and there is no doubt about the hopeful spirit that pervaded the democracy there. Hon. John Sharp Williams, leader of the minority in the house of representatives, was one of the speakers at this banquet.

At the Iroquois club in Chicago a luncheon was given on the 6th of December, at which the various factions of the party were represented and harmony prevailed. On the evening of the 6th a banquet was held at Freeport, Ill., which was in many respects remarkable. The city has between twenty and twenty-five thousand inhabitants, and is one of the few cities in northern Illinois which has a democratic majority. Crowded meetings were held at the opera house and at the court house, and then six hundred and ninety persons sat down to a banquet at 11 o'clock. The speaking commenced a little after twelve and concluded at a quarter of five in the morning. When it is remembered that a considerable number of the banqueters were republicans, the interest shown certainly indicates a change in sentiment since 1896. Freeport is the home of Hon. Douglass Patterson, the brilliant young leader of the minority in the Illinois legislature, and Mr. Patterson acted as toastmaster at this banquet.

On the evening of the 7th a banquet was held in Omaha under the auspices of the Dahlman Democracy, a club named after Hon. James C. Dahlman, the present mayor of Omaha and the present Nebraska member of the national committee. Something over twelve hundred persons sat down to the banquet and several thousand heard the speeches from the gallery. This was the largest banquet ever held in Nebraska, and probably the largest in the west. Mr. Bryan spoke at each of these banquets and was gratified to find the democrats so enthusiastic and so ready to begin the campaign work for 1908.

THE VIEWS OF A VETERAN

Mr. O. O. Staley, the veteran Washington correspondent of the Louisville Courier-Journal, has published an exceedingly interesting volume entitled "Twenty Years in the Press Gallery." His intimate acquaintance with the public men who have marched in procession before him and whose public work has been dissected by him gives him eminent fitness for the judicial task which he has taken upon himself. Besides containing a review of important legislation and his estimate of men and measures, the book contains pen sketches by prominent newspaper men of the leading statesmen of the period. The versatile Watterson has written a characteristic introduction for the book, and Clifford K. Berryman has prepared the illustrations. The book is published by the author through the Publishers' Printing Company of New York, and ought to find a large sale.

NO CENTRAL BANK

The comptroller of the currency has recommended a central bank but his recommendation is not likely to be favorably received. Even Congressman Dalzell, who is called an ultra-representative of the corporate interests, is quoted as saying that Andrew Jackson has not been

dead long enough to make a central bank popular. No, the lesson that Andrew Jackson taught is not yet forgotten. His fight against the national bank—the great bank of his day—formed an epoch in our history, and the fight would have to be made over again if we allowed one to be established. A central bank with branches throughout the country would soon absorb the business of the country and give us a money trust even more despotic than the present one. While it is not at all probable that the republican leaders will agree upon a plan for a national bank, it is well for the democrats to be on their guard and ready to give a united opposition to anything that looks toward the establishment of a central bank.

CIRCULATE PETITIONS

D. Guthrie of Superior, Neb., writing to The Commoner, makes this excellent suggestion: "In your last edition of The Commoner you say we should all write our senators and congressmen to work for the government to guarantee the bank deposits. We find in talking with the bankers as well as the people of both parties that they favor this measure and we believe we could get up large petitions signed by democrats and republicans and believe each petitioner should state his politics. Could you not urge through the next Commoner to get a petition in every town in our state as well as every other state? I will be one that will try and see every voter in our precinct."

It would be well if a petition were sent from every town and precinct in the United States. The petition might be addressed to the senators of the state and the representative of the particular district in which the petition is circulated. It should urge them to give their support to the immediate enactment of a law providing, under proper regulations, for the guarantee by the government of deposits in national banks.

THE CURRENCY QUESTION

There are two phases of the currency question which are demanding attention. The first relates to the kind of currency we shall have. For years the banking interests have been endeavoring to secure an asset currency. After they found that they could not bring the country to the approval of an asset currency as a permanent currency, they changed their tactics and asked for it as a temporary currency. They have magnified the importance of elasticity and sent out long discourses on the injury done to the agricultural sections by a scarcity of money during the period of crop moving. The very men who shouted themselves hoarse declaring that we had plenty of money in 1896 have been clamoring for the right to issue more money even when the per capita circulation has increased more than fifty per cent. These financiers have seized upon the present financial stringency to force their plan through congress, but they have not deceived the democrats, and it is evident that many republicans understand the plan. Steadfast resistance ought to be offered to any plan that contemplates a change in the basis for the bank note circulation. The president indicates that he is willing to approve of a measure which will permit the issue of temporary bank note currency on bonds deposited. While this would be better than currency issued on the general assets of the bank, it is not necessary to make even this change. Whatever elastic currency is needed ought to be supplied by the government by the issue of United States notes like those now in circulation, and these notes can be loaned to not only national banks but state banks. In fact, the security being regulated by law and the interest fixed by law, there is no reason why the loan should not be made to individuals as well as to banks, and surely there is no reason why such loans should be confined to national banks. We already have the United States note in circulation, and it is a legal tender. The bank note is not a legal tender, and being redeemable not specifically in gold or silver but in lawful money, was never better than the greenback during the war, for the banks exercised the right to redeem their bank note in greenbacks.

There is another kind of emergency currency that might be provided for, namely, emergency currency issued upon government bonds. If banks were allowed to keep a part of the reserves in government bonds and allowed to deposit these bonds as security for a loan of bank notes whenever they needed to use the reserve, they could make as much money on that part of the reserve as they now do upon the reserve loaned to other banks. According to the present law banks are allowed to count as reserve money deposited in the national banks of reserve cities, and they avail themselves of this law in order to draw interest upon their reserves. They cannot loan the reserves to individuals but by loaning them to banks, they derive the income—usually about two per cent. If instead of being allowed to keep a part of the reserves in other banks they were compelled to keep the reserves in their own banks but allowed to count government bonds as a part of the reserve, they could protect themselves against emergencies and yet draw interest upon so much of their reserves as was covered by the bonds. There is no reason why the government bond should not be made available for borrowing from the government whether the bond is held by individuals or by banks, but by allowing the banks to keep part of the reserves in the bonds, they could escape the perils involved in the loaning of their reserve to other banks.

The other phase of the money question as it now presents itself relates to the security of depositors. The Wall Street financiers have no plan for the protection of depositors, and they resent any plan which will lessen the advantage which the big bank has over the little bank. Just now, however, the big bank is responsible for the one, and by refusing to return the money deposited with it by the smaller banks, has made the stringency as wide as the nation. The scare which has come upon depositors is likely to stimulate hoarding for some time to come. Not that depositors are justified in being frightened but because they are frightened, and a fright is a fright whether it is reasonable or unreasonable. Something ought to be done to restore confidence among the depositors. The president has recommended a postal savings bank. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go

far enough, and if it did, it would soon involve the government in a large amount of unnecessary work. The guarantee of the banks is more simple and involves less extension of governmental activity.

Two methods have been proposed for the protection of depositors, first—a guarantee fund; second—absolute security. Mr. Bryan advocated the guarantee fund some thirteen or fourteen years ago and endeavored to secure the passage of a bill providing for such a fund. It was defeated then, although it is probable that it would be more popular now. An absolute guarantee, however, is better than a guarantee fund, first—because it can be put into operation more quickly, and second—because it leaves no room whatever for the operation of fear or a scare. It would require some time to raise a guarantee fund sufficient to give confidence to the depositors, and no matter how large the fund might be, it would be so small in proportion to the total deposits that the more timid would still feel that they ran some risk in depositing. But an absolute guarantee upon the part of the government would restore confidence at once, and yet, the government would really incur no risk, for judging the future by the past, the loss which it would have to bear would be little, and this loss could be collected from the banks in proportion to their deposits. The capital stock and the surplus of the banks would be the government's security, and in addition to the capital and surplus, the government would also have the hundred per cent liability which is imposed upon stockholders by law. A deposit in a government bank would be as good as a government bond, and until the states provide for a similar guarantee of state banks, state banks might be allowed to avail themselves of the national guarantee by putting themselves upon an equal footing with national banks as to inspection and security.

When bankers are approached with this plan, they at once suggest that more strict supervision of banks would be necessary. That is not an obection to the plan but one of the merits of it. When banks become liable for each other's deposits, they will be interested in better regulation and it will them be possible to secure laws that will prevent the exploitation of a bank by the directors

or officers and other laws which will prevent grain and stock gambling by officials and directors.

If it is urged that the government ought not to go into the business of securing bank deposits, it may be answered that one of the purposes of government is to enable people to do together what they cannot so well do separately. For instance, the school system illustrates the co-operative power of the people as does the mail service. Every extension of governmental activity has been objected to on the ground that it would take the government into a new department. The rural delivery was objected to on that ground, and yet, who would today criticize the government for attempting to bring the advantages of mail delivery to the farmers? It is certain that we must either have the guaranteed bank or the postal savings bank, and the guaranteed bank will involve the government in less work than the postal savings bank. The government now takes charge of every failed bank, collects its assets and applies them to the discharge of the bank's liabilities. That is all that would be done under the system of guaranteed banks, and as runs would be prevented and regulation be made more strict, there would be fewer failures than today. The guaranteed bank, therefore, would reduce rather than increase the government's entrance into business, but the guarantee of the government would be of immeasurable value to the country by making the banks absolutely safe. The banks, too, would profit by it because the tax which they would have to pay to reimburse the government on losses would be small compared with the profits that they would make out of the money drawn from hiding.

It has been urged that bank officials would be less careful if deposits were made secure. This argument is absurd, for the officials are selected by the directors, who are in turn responsible to the stockholders, and as the stockholders would lose everything before the depositors would lose anything, the officials would be under the same restraint that they are today. It is not necessary that the deposits should be insecure or that the community should be subjected to the embarrassments that follow a bank failure in order to make bank officials attend to their business. The criminal law can add a far

greater restraint than is imposed by the helplessness of depositors. The democratic party is not in power, but looking at the question from the standpoint of the interests of the whole people, it ought to urge remedies which will meet the present need and protect the public as far as possible from a recurrence of such panics as that through which we are now passing.

NOW WATCH FOR TRUST AMENDMENT

The senators and members should be on their guard against the amendment which is likely to be proposed to the Sherman law. It is quite certain that no anti-trust legislation is going to be proposed by the republican leaders this session, but it is more than likely that they will attempt to smuggle through an amendment of the Sherman law which will paralyze its usefulness. There has been a good deal of talk of inserting the word "unreasonable" in the law so that it will not prohibit combinations in restraint of trade but only combinations which unreasonably restrain trade. This leaves everything with the judge, and he decides whether the restraint complained of is an unreasonable one. The insertion of the word "unreasonable" would nullify the law and the democrats ought to resist to the last any such attempt. If the republican leaders will present a law which draws the line at monopoly and arbitrarily fixes the per cent of the product which the corporation or combination can control, then the present law can be entirely repealed, but so long as this is the only law on the statute books, it would be a backward step to weaken it at all. It would be as sensible to talk of amending the law against burglary so as to prevent an unreasonable taking of a man's property or prohibiting more than two burglars to enter a house at one time or preventing the burglars from taking more than half they found in the house. It would be as sensible to amend the law against killing by limiting punishment to killing which was brutal, leaving the polite and refined taking of life to go unpunished.

Watch the republican leaders in the house and senate a

little and see that they not only have no thought of protecting the public from the trusts, but will, as soon as they dare do so, weaken the existing laws on the subject. As a campaign is approaching, they may not have the courage to present at this time the amendment which they desire; but wait until the short session that meets after the election—the job session—and they will bring out their scheme for the further protection of the trusts.

OKLAHOMA—PIONEER!

Oklahoma, the newest of the states, is plunging at once into politics. Having adopted the best constitution in the United States, she is now prepared to set the country an example in matters of legislation. While they have been discussing the guarantee of bank deposits in other places, her legislature has gone to work and a system has been adopted which, coming into operation on the 17th of February, will give to the depositors the benefit of a guaranty fund. The following is the press dispatch announcing the inauguration of the system:

"Guthrie, Okla., Dec. 18.—The new banking law for Oklahoma, whereby is provided a guaranty fund for the protection of depositors in insolvent banks, will become operative February 17, 1908. Its makers believe it will make impossible a run on an individual bank or permit a money panic in the state. Each state bank is required to pay to the state banking board a sum equal to one per cent of its daily average deposits. Whenever this sum is depleted it shall be increased by further assessments. When a bank fails, the state bank examiner steps in and forthwith pays the depositors from the guaranty funds held by the banking board. These payments become a first lien on the assets of the defunct bank. National banks that wish to avail themselves of the benefits of the law may do so upon a plan agreed upon by the banking board, the bank commissioner and the comptroller of the currency of the United States."

Good for Oklahoma! The guarantee fund is good; an absolute guarantee would be better and involve no real risk to the government, for the state would have the assets of all the banks to secure it. It will be interesting to watch the experiment, and if it is a success, as it doubtless will be, it will be copied by other states.

Oklahoma is wise in admitting national banks to share in the benefits of the plan. We shall sometime come to a guarantee of national banks, but until that time it is only fair that the national banks established in a state shall share in the benefits of the state guaranty fund.

NEBRASKA IN EVIDENCE

Nebraska is coming to the front. It used to be that they thought our state too far west to be of political importance and too small to present a national candidate, but times have changed. The press dispatches the other day announced that Governor Magoon, of Cuba, a Nebraskan, was being considered as a presidential candidate. While the governor has asked his friends not to mention his name in that connection, still the fact that he has been thought of in that connection shows that Nebraska is on the political map; and then, too, we have an abundance of vice presidential timber. Only the other day the papers were announcing Hughes and Burkett, the name of one of Nebraska's senators being linked with that of the governor of New York. A little while before Hon. A. R. Talbot was spoken of as a possible nominee for vice president. Mr. Talbot has long been prominent in Nebraska politics, and is now the head of the Modern Woodman Order of the United States. How would Taft and Talbot do for a republican ticket? And then there is Governor Sheldon; his name has been mentioned. What would you think of Cannon and Sheldon?—that could be changed to Cannon and Shellthem. And why should we overlook Senator Brown? What is the matter with Knox and Brown? Knox was attorney general of the United States and Brown was attorney general of Nebraska.

Then there is John L. Webster, who might restore the parity in Nebraska if Foraker were nominated.

Let it be known that Nebraska stands ready to furnish an associate for any republican who may be nominated for president, and she has a republican who would make a better race than some of the candidates who have been mentioned for the presidency. The west is coming to the front; it is no longer the great American desert whether you consider it from the standpoint of crops or politics.

Hurrah for Nebraska!

A FEW STRAWS

The Commoner is gratified to find that its position is in harmony with the sentiment of the business men of Lincoln on several important questions. Lincoln, as the readers of this paper know, is strongly republican, and on the political questions which have divided the parties in the past the republicans have largely outvoted the democrats. On the new questions that are arriving, however, there seems to be a re-alignment and the sentiment is becoming more democratic.

As an illustration of this, attention is called to a vote recently taken in the Commercial club of Lincoln. This club has about six hundred members, and the membership is almost entirely composed of business men and professional men. Recently the secretary sent out a list of subjects upon which the opinion of the members was asked. Three of these questions have been discussed in The Commoner, namely—the postal savings bank, the guaranteed bank and the asset currency. The vote on these three questions is as follows:

For postal savings bank	250
Against postal savings bank	91
For guaranteed bank	316
Against guaranteed bank	32
For asset currency	50
Against asset currency	261

It will be noticed that the vote is almost unanimous in favor of the guaranteed bank, a system which the Com-

moner has strongly endorsed. The vote is almost unanimous, too, against an asset currency, which The Commoner has strongly denounced. The majority for the postal savings bank is not as much as it is for the guaranteed bank, and this, too, is in harmony with the Commoner's position. While it favors the postal savings bank in places where there is no guaranteed bank, it believes that the guaranteed bank has advantages over the postal savings bank. The position taken by the business men of Lincoln on these questions is very encouraging, and if their position can be taken as the position of business men elsewhere, the prospects of the democratic party are indeed bright, for it is quite certain that the republican leaders will not permit any real reforms to be accomplished, and it is evident that the business men of the country are tired of waiting for reforms. They want something done that will be helpful to the public, and it is becoming more and more evident that they will have to look to the democratic party for relief.

These votes are straws indicating the direction of public opinion.

A WORD TO STATE BANKERS

The state bank is to be found everywhere, and in the smaller communities it is often the only bank. Has the state banker considered the currency situation as it presents itself at this time? The national bankers of the cities are clamoring for an asset currency—that is, for a currency which they can issue on their assets without the deposit of government bonds with the treasury department. At first they tried to secure a complete change in the basis of their bank notes but failing in this, they have been urging the asset currency as an emergency currency. The state bankers ought to let their congressmen know that there is objection to the asset currency either as a permanent currency or as an emergency currency. There is no reason why the government should not issue whatever asset currency the country needs. If the government instead of the banks issues this currency, it can issue treasury notes, and these treasury notes can be

loaned to the state banks as well as to the national banks. The policy of the treasury department has been to take care of Wall Street and then trust Wall Street to take care of the rest of the country, but it is an absurd and foolish policy. If asset currency is needed, there is no reason why it should not be furnished in such a way that the state bank as well as the national bank can relieve a local stringency. If we are to have an emergency currency, let it be issued by the government and controlled by the government; let congress fix the kind of security and then let the currency be loaned to the state bank as well as to the national bank. There is no reason for the discrimination that is constantly made in favor of the national bank. It is time that the state bankers voiced their protest against this favoritism.

THE COUNTRY NEWSPAPER

There ought to be a democratic weekly newspaper in every county; where there is no such weekly, one ought to be established. It does not cost much to start or to conduct a weekly newspaper. It can be owned and edited by the same man. The country weekly has far more influence in proportion to its circulation than the city daily, first, because it has behind it a person who is known to the readers and whose character adds force to his words; second, because the weekly is read with more care. The country weekly comes much nearer reflecting the sentiment of the community than the large daily. In fact, in every contest between the unorganized masses on the one side and organized wealth on the other, the big newspapers are generally on the side of organized wealth, and this fact has become so notorious that candidates are often elected with practically all of the daily papers against them.

In 1896 when nearly all of the great dailies deserted us, the weeklies were faithful because they were near to the people and shared the opinions and aspirations of the multitude.

The editorial page of the democratic weekly ought to

be large enough to present briefly the democratic side of the questions upon which the people are thinking. Having local as well as general politics to consider, the country weekly cannot of course give the attention to national questions that a national paper can, for a national paper does not have to devote any space to local questions, but each issue of the country weekly ought to contain a discussion, however brief, of the more important questions before the country.

The country weekly ought also to have a Washington letter—not a letter sent out by some unknown correspondent, who, being paid to advance some secret interest, furnishes his stuff for nothing, but a letter by someone who is known as a democrat and who sends out reliable news.

The weekly newspaper ought to discuss candidates and platforms so that the voters can act intelligently when the time comes for selection.

The Commoner will be glad to exchange with any and every democratic weekly in the country, for it is interested in keeping in touch with the papers that mold public opinion. If your county has no democratic weekly, organize one and get it to work; if your county has a democratic weekly, support it and strengthen it and increase its usefulness.

THE WISE AGE

A reader of The Commoner sends in the following:

"At ten years of age a boy thinks his father knows a great deal.

"At fifteen he knows as much as his father;

"At twenty he knows twice as much;

"At thirty he is willing to take his advice;

"At forty he begins to think his father knew something after all;

"At fifty he begins to seek his advice;

"And at sixty, after his father is dead, he thinks he was the smartest man that ever lived."

The above correctly states the stages through which

one passes. At about eighteen or twenty the boy feels stronger than he ever does afterwards and thinks he knows more than he ever does know, but he learns after awhile to respect the wisdom of his father, especially when he becomes a father. There is an education in all of the experiences of life. The parent educates the child and the child in turn enlarges the vision of the parent. Brothers and sisters exert an influence upon each other, and another part of our knowledge is gathered from rubbing up against the world.

If the child could only learn in youth that years have given valuable experience to the parent, the child might be saved much costly folly, but some children insist upon learning by experience, and they generally get the experience.

There is a common saying that the young man has to sow his wild oats. This is a complacent excuse given for youthful indiscretions, but it does not state the truth. It is not necessary that a boy should be bad in order to be good afterwards. It is from every standpoint better that his life shall be so regulated from the beginning that the memory is not stained by scars and blots. If the confidence which the boy has in his father at ten continued until he was twenty-five, he would not only escape the habits that carry so many to ruin but would be the stronger for life's work.

REFERENCE INDEX

Abbot, Willis J., 369.
Abolish the Stock Exchange Ticker, 367.
Adams Express Co., 3.
Address Before the Washington Legislature, Mr. Bryan's, 35.
A Diagram, 126.
Advertising Confidence Games, 161.
After Asset Currency Again, 326.
A Few Straws, 416.
After the Election, 248.
Albert, Marceline, 228, 229.
Aldrich Bill, 33, 93, 94, 95.
Aldrich Bill "Joker," 93.
Alford, William, 165, 166.
Allen, Representative John, 190.
Along the Pacific Coast, 22.
Alschuler, Samuel, 53.
Altgeld, John P., 52.
Always "Manana," 264.
American Bankers' Association, 347.
American Federation of Labor, 339.
American Lawyer, The, 196.
American Newspaper Publishers' Association, 307, 308, 311.
American, New York, 135.
Amsterdam Democratic Club, 254.
Anderson, William, 139.
Andrew Carnegie's Magic Lamp, 104.
And the New York Herald Said It, 352.
An Object Lesson, 329.
Another Orator, 228.
Another Straw Man, 330.
A Question of Authorship, 171.
Arbitration, 230, 231, 379.
As Clear as Mud, 62.
Asp, Mr. of Oklahoma, 160.
Asset Currency, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 97, 326, 327, 340, 341, 347, 348, 377, 409, 417, 418.
Asset Currency Bill Scheme, 17, 85.
At the Grave of Governor Hogg, 79.
Awakening, The Moral, 4.
A Word to State Bankers, 417.
A Word on Speculation, 213.
A Work of Art, 254.

Babbitt, Clinton, 59.
Babcock, Representative, 32.
Baltimore & Ohio Ry., 138.
Bangor & Aroostock Ry., 166, 167.
Baskin, Representative, 79.
"Before Richmond," 199.
Bennett Fountain, The, 385.
Bennett, Philo Sherman, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391.
Benton, Thomas H., 281.
Be Patient, Depositors, 351.
Berryman, Clifford K., 407.
Beveridge, Senator, 115.
Billion Dollar Asset, 259.
Blackford, James M., 277.
Blake, Mr., 385.
Blount, James, 57.
Bonaparte, Secretary, 174.
Borah, Senator, 256.
Brown, Mayor Francis W., 132, 277.
Brown, Senator Norris, 415.
Bryan, W. J., 22, 35, 52, 65, 66, 67, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 105, 111, 113, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 179, 204, 205, 213, 214, 215, 216, 220, 233, 235, 238, 251, 254, 257, 258, 264, 270, 276, 283, 303, 304, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 342, 343, 344, 345, 347, 348, 356, 357, 358, 362, 363, 368, 369, 372, 384, 385, 387, 391, 392, 406, 407, 411.
Burleigh, A. B., 167.
Burlington Ry., 72.
Burton, Representative, 313, 314, 324, 325, 346.
Business Honor, 1.
By the Masses, of Course, 205.

Call, Henry L., 16.
Campaign Contributions, 2, 157, 220, 221, 378, 383, 384, 394.
Campaign Expenses, 392, 394, 395.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 226.
Campbell, Governor, 79, 83.
Canestorp, O. O., 169.
Cannon, Speaker Joseph G., 284, 415.
Carmack, Senator Edward, 200.
Carnegie, Andrew, 2, 32, 85, 87, 95, 104, 105.
Cartright, Peter, 258.
Cashman, T. E., 169.

Cassidy, Ed. O., 265.
Centralization, Dangers of, 106, 107, 118.
Central Law Journal, 137, 139.
Channing, William C., 268.
Champion of Plutocracy, A., 85.
Chicago Platform, 268, 269.
Chicago & Alton Ry., 86.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry., 109.
Chicago Great Western Ry., 118, 169.
Christmas, 393.
Chronicle, Chicago, 14, 105, 204.
Chronicle, London, 196.
Clark, George, 129.
Clear on One Point, Anyway, 113.
Cleveland, Grover, 60, 69, 111, 112, 175, 360.
Cleveland on Insurance, 111.
Coal Trust, 3.
Cockrell, Senator F. M., 82.
Coleman Mining Co., 359.
Comer, Governor, 82, 266, 267.
Commercial Advertiser, New York, 32.
Commercial Club, Lincoln, 416.
Commoner, The, 3, 59, 65, 95, 103, 114, 115, 122, 126, 127, 132, 135, 160, 162, 163, 166, 172, 173, 174, 205, 249, 256, 264, 265, 267, 268, 277, 278, 303, 314, 339, 351, 352, 379, 393, 408, 416, 419.
Conservative South, The, 98.
Constitution Supreme, The, 115.
Copper Trust, 3.
"Cornfield Lawyers," 73.
Corn Products Co., 15.
Cortelyou, Secretary G. B., 126, 175, 360.
Country Newspaper, The, 418.
Courant, Hartford, 32, 125, 128, 129, 131.
Courier-Journal, Louisville, 407.
Creighton, John A., 29.
Culberson, Senator, 174, 400, 401.
Currency Question, The, 409.
Curtis, William E., 245.

Dahlman Club, Omaha, 407.
Dahlman, James C., 407.
Dalzell, Representative, 407.
Darrow, Clarence, 256.
Davidson, Attorney General, 309.
Davidson, Representative, 78.
Davidson, Lieutenant-Governor, 79.
Davis, Jefferson, 199.
Death Claims Two Friends, 165.
Defending the States, 309.
Demand of Labor, The, 71.
Democrat-Chronicle, 317.
Democratic Outlook, The, 229.
Democratic Position, The, 121.
Depew, Chauncey M., 3, 73, 82.
Destiny, 3.
Dewey, Admiral George, 306.
Dickson, Attorney General, 309.
Dingley Law, 31, 260, 269, 326.
Dingley, Nelson, 31.
Directories, Duplicate, 46.
Direct Primary, The, 29.
Dittenhoefer, Judge A. J., 367.
Dodd, Professor, 329.
Dollivar, Senator J. P., 31.
Do They Favor Regulation? 251.
Doubtful Endorsement, A, 95.
Dumas, Alexander, 4, 159.
Dunne, Mayor Edward, 53.
Duplicate Directories, 46, 47.

Earning the Title, 337.
Easily Answered, 140.
Elkins Law, 267, 273, 274.
Emergency Currency, 18, 19, 20, 21.
Employers' Liability, 378.
Enquirer, Cincinnati, 133.
Equitable Assurance Co., 89.
Evading the Law, 237.
Evans, Governor, 200.
Everybody's Magazine, 235.

Fake News From Lincoln, 173.
Fairbanks, Charles W., 62, 63, 284.
Faith, 238.
Far-Reaching Corporate Influence, 234.
Faust, Senator, 79.
Federal Regulation, 327, 332.
Field, Marshall, 7.
Fletcher, Attorney General, 309.
Foraker, Senator Charles B., 175.
Frightened Again, 120.
From Jackson to Roosevelt, 33.
Fulton, Representative, 297.

Garber, Attorney General, 309.
Garfield, Secretary, 175.
Gate City, Keokuk, 32.
Gates, John D., 3.
General Lee's Example, 69.
Georgia State Platform, 98, 99, 100, 101.
Glenn, Governor, 247, 266.
Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, 247, 250, 264, 265, 266, 267.
Going Democratic, 34.
Goodby to the Chronicle, 204.

Good Example, A, 339.
Good for Landis! 255.
Good for the President! 139.
Government Ownership, 65, 66, 78, 106, 111, 153, 226, 227, 251, 252, 274, 275.
Government Ownership Not an Issue, 226.
Government Regulation, 74.
Governor Haskell's Prompt Action, 366.
Governor Hughes' Veto, 206.
Governor Woodruff, 125.
Graft, 12.
Gratifying, 34.
Gratitude, 365.
Graves, John Temple, 105.
Greeks Bearing Gifts, 163.
Gridiron Club, 143.
Grier, Justice. 138.
Grosvenor, Charles H., 133.
Guaranteed Bank Deposits, 361, 362, 380, 381, 382, 383, 411, 412, 414, 415.
Guthrie, D., 408.

Hadley, Attorney General, 203, 309.
Hague Agreement, 64.
Hague Court, The, 312.
Hamilton, Alexander, 210, 372.
Harriman, E. H., 4, 52, 65, 69, 70, 71, 82, 85, 86, 87, 127, 236.
Harrison, President Benjamin, 9, 60.
Haskell, Governor, 296, 366, 367.
Havemeyer, W. H., 156, 222.
Hayes, Rutherford B., 60.
Haywood Trial, The, 256.
Haywood, William, 127, 256, 257.
Hearst, William R., 2, 113, 114, 115, 136.
Help Oklahoma, 265.
Henry, Patrick, 178, 182, 183, 185, 186, 191.
Herald, New York, 70, 352, 353, 365.
High Finance, 353.
Hill, James J., 65, 71, 72.
Hogg, Governor, 79.
Holshousen, Representative, 79.
Homestead Strike, 9.
Hopkins, Senator, 248, 260.
How Will They Explain? 311.
Hughes, Governor, 206, 207.
Humiliated, 105.

If Unchecked and Unpunished, 52.
Ignorance, 4.
In a Bad Way, 119.
Income Tax, 66, 97, 117, 231, 269, 273, 378.
Independence League, 113, 114, 115, 135, 136.
Indestructible, 247.
Infidelity, Real, 64.
Individualism, 48.
Inheritance Tax, 14.
Initiative and Referendum, 42, 120, 121, 140, 142, 143, 148, 149, 151, 154, 160, 161, 170, 171, 194, 197, 273, 287, 288.
Injunction, Government by, 399.
Illinois Central Ry., 86.
In Oklahoma, 282.
Interlocking Corporations, 28.
International Marriage, The, 17.
International Misrepresentation, 358.
Inter-Ocean, Chicago, 64.
Interstate Commerce Commission, 27.
Irish Bill, The, 195.
Iroquois Club, Chicago, 406.
Is This Calamity? 137.
It All Depends, 365.

Jackson, Andrew, 33, 249, 250, 380, 408.
Jackson, From Roosevelt to, 33.
Jackson on Money, 249.
James on Asset Currency, 85.
Japanese Question, The, 219.
James, Representative Ollie, 85, 369.
Jamestown Exposition, The, 178, 179.
Jefferson, Thomas, 60, 182, 209, 210, 276, 372.
Jingoes at Work, The, 237.
Jenks, Professor, 1.
Johnson and Burton, 324.
Johnson, Andrew, 41.
Johnson, Mayor Tom, 313, 314, 324, 325, 346, 347.
Jordan, Conrad N., 94.
Journal of Finance, Chicago, 213, 215, 216.
Journal, Kansas City, 85, 87, 88, 232, 233.
Journal, Minneapolis, 32.
Journal, Sioux City, 363.
Journal, Wall Street, 34, 71, 72, 94, 105, 113, 164, 165, 202, 203, 362.

Kahn, Representative, 316.
Kaiser's Policy, The, 403.
Kansas City Platform, 269.
Kansas City Southern Ry., 86.
Kentucky, 405.
Knox, Senator, 163, 164, 237, 234, 415.
Kuhn, Loeb & Co., 3.

Labor, The Demands of, 71.
LaFollette, Senator Robert M., 27, 46, 89, 96, 97, 113, 116, 323, 402.
Landis, Judge K. M., 203, 255, 279.
Lawson's Remedy, 235.
Lawson, Thomas W., 235, 237.
Leader, London, 195.
Leader, New Haven, 129.
Ledger, Philadelphia, 32.
Lee, Gen. Robert E., 69, 70.
Leslie's Weekly, 279, 280.
Let the Foreigner Pay It, 316.
Let the People Rule, 143, 356.
Licensing Interstate Corporations, 167.
Lincoln, Abraham, 114, 290.
Lincoln, Nebr., Commercial Club, 416.
Lincoln, Fake News From, 173.
Lincoln, Nebr., Initiative and Referendum, 170.
Lincoln, Nebr., Municipal Ownership in, 277, 278.
Locating the Blame, 298.
Loeb, Secretary William, 313.
Longworth, Representative Nicholas, 116.
Love, T. B., 79.

Macauley, Lord, 183.
Mackey, John, 3.
Magoon, Governor Charles, 415.
Mail, London, 196.
Maine Central Ry., 168.
Malone, Attorney General, 309.
Manahan, James, 169.
"Manana," 277.
Mansfield, Richard, 60.
Martin, Representative, 322, 323.
Man vs. Money, 306.
McKinley Law, 31, 269.
McKinley, President William, 216.
McNeil, Archibald, 129.
Metcalf, Secretary 175.
Meyer, Secretary, 175.
Minority Leaders Chosen, 400.
Misrepresenting Municipal Ownership, 277.
Missed LaFollette, 113.
Model Constitution (Oklahoma), 95.
Monarchy, Constitutional, 60, 61.
Monarchy Suggested, 60.
Money Above Duty. 88.
Money in Hiding, 354.
Monroe Doctrine, 64.
Moral Awakening, The, 4.
Morgan, J. Pierpont, 2, 34, 65, 71, 126, 365.
Morgan, Senator John T., 201.
Morton, Levi P., 2.
Morton, Paul, 89.
Moseley, Commissioner, 118.
Moss, Judge M. J., 359.
Mr. Bryan at the National Capital, 368.
Mr. Bryan in New England, 128.
Mr. Bryan on Campaign Contributions, 220.
Mr. Bryan's Positon, 342.
Mr. Bryan's Sermon, 131.
Mr. Bryan, Speech on "Faith," 238.
Mr. Hearst's New Party, 113.
Mount, Governor, 32.
Moyer, William, 127.
Municipal Initiative and Referendum, 170.
Municipal Ownership, 277.
Mysteries, 78.

National Bank of Commerce, New York, 126.
National Incorporation of Railroads, 333, 375.
National Union of Railway Trackmen, 298, 315, 316.
Nebraska and the Ship Subsidy, 30.
Nebraska in Evidence, 415.
Nebraska Platform, The, 316.
Nelson, S. A., 169.
News, Beloit, 59.
News, Indianapolis, 32.
News, London, 195.
Newspaper, The Weekly, 53.
New York Central Ry., 3.
No Bankers' Trust, 354.
No Central Bank, 407.
No Danger of Panic, 251.
North American, Philadelphia, 324, 325.
North American Review, 57.
Northern Pacific Ry., 72.
Northern Securities, 237.
Not a Matter of Ambition, 235.
No Tariff Revision, 30.
No Taxation Without Representation, 379.
Now Watch for Trust Amendments, 413.
Oglesby, Governor Richard, 150.
Oklahoma Constitution, The, 196.
Oklahoma, Official Count, 317.
Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, 366.
Oklahoma, Pioneer! 414.
Oklahoma Victory, The, 301.
Oklahoma Wins, 305.
One More "Defender," 14.

Open the Books, 363.
Opening the Campaign, 406.
Opposing Oklahoma Statehood, 159.
Oregonian, Portland, 32.
Outlook, New York, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337.
Overmeyer, David, 16.
Owership, Government, 65.
Ownership, Ultimate, 65, 66.

Panic, 58.
Parker, Alton B., 331.
Patterson, Douglas, 406.
Pecuniary, 393.
Perkins, George W., 126.
Pettigrew, Senator, 234.
Philippine Independence, 57.
Pioneer-Press, St. Paul, 32.
Plaindealer, Cleveland, 70.
Planning for War, 205.
Platt, Senator T. C., 73.
Plumb, Senator, 31.
Pollard, Representative E. M., 102.
Popular Government Spreads, 226.
Postal Savings Bank, 361, 379.
Post, C. W., 117.
Post, Houston, 267, 338.
Post-Intelligencer, Seattle, 35.
Post, Kansas City, 303.
Post, Louis F., 365.
Post, New York Evening, 316.
Post, Washington, 70, 140, 141, 143.
Praising Roosevelt, 257.
President Defends Subsidy, 102.
President's Message, The, 375.
President Reiterates Declination, 401.
President Urges Centralization, 270.
Press-Post, Columbus, 324.
Press, Sioux Falls, 175.
Primary, The Direct, 29.
Prominent Mention, 394.
Protecting Depositors, 348.
Prove it Now, 279.
Public, Chicago, 365.
Publicity, 82.
Pushing Asset Currency, 347.

Railroads, National Incorporation of, 333.
Railway Trackmen, National Union of, 298, 299, 300, 315, 316.
Railroad View, A, 232.
Railroad Management, 55.
Railroad Regulation, 116, 189, 228, 230, 254, 369, 373.
Railroads, The Valuation of, 169.
Railway Magnates Pleased, 245.
Raising a False Issue, 265.
Rate Legislation Necessary, 27.
Reader Magazine, 384.
Real Infidelity, 64.
Rebate, 45, 120, 190.
Record, Fort Worth, 79.
Record-Herald, Chicago, 32, 60, 117, 245, 259, 260.
Reduce the Interstate Rate, 246.
Regulation, 45, 74, 75, 76, 77, 97, 327, 329, 330, 331, 332, 335, 336, 337.
Remarkable Editorial, A, 34.
Republican Advice, 133.
Republican Campaign Funds, 338.
Republican, Rockford, 32.
Republican, Springfield, 132, 392.
Republic, St. Louis, 317.
Rewards, Law of, 49, 50, 51.
Ripley, President, 4.
Robertson, Judge J. H., 79, 80.
Robertson, Representative, 79.
Rockefeller, John D., 3, 71, 72, 85, 87, 202, 203, 255, 324, 365.
Root, Secretary Elihu, 115, 175, 178, 233.
Roosevelt, From Jackson to, 33.
Roosevelt, President Theodore, 33, 34, 60, 68, 70, 82, 83, 95, 96, 105, 113, 116, 117, 139, 140, 164, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 218, 237, 257, 258, 276, 281, 282, 302, 311, 312, 313, 314, 317, 323, 329, 331, 346, 360, 363, 383, 401.
Russian Reform, 63, 93.

St. Louis Book Co., 367.
Santa Fe Ry., 4, 86, 160.
Saving His Face, 70.
Schiff, Jacob, 3.
Schwab, C. M., 3, 259, 260, 305.
Secretary Taft's Mother, 403.
Shaw, Leslie M., 16, 21, 340.
Shea, John, 366.
Sheldon, Governor George L., 415.
Sherman Anti-Trust Law, 68, 255, 267.
Sherman, John, 31.
Ship Subsidy, 30, 102, 103, 104.
Shocking Story, A, 314.
Shonts, Theodore, 88.
Silent on the Tariff, 281.
Simpson, F. M., 167.
Senators, Direct Election of, 66, 67, 193.
Sentinel, Milwaukee, 270.
Seymour, H. W., 204.
Skinner, Senator, 79.
Smith, Governor Hoke, 83.
Socialism, 48, 49.
Society's Ban, 28.

Somerset Ry., 168.
Southern Candidate, The, 82.
Southern Illinois Ry., 236.
Southern Indiana Ry., 15.
Speculation, A Word on, 213.
Spooner, Senator, 89.
Springfield, O., Trades and Labor Assembly, 339.
Standard Oil Co., 44, 236, 267, 278, 279, 324, 366, 367.
Staley, O. O., 407.
Star, Washington, 52.
State vs. Nation, 61.
Statesman or Financier, Which? 90.
Starch Trust, The, 15, 81.
Steal in Steel, The, 81.
Steel Trust, 3, 191, 259.
Stickney, President, 118.
Stolypin, Premier, 63.
Stop the Gambling, 354.
Strange Advisors, 174.
Strauss, Secretary, 175.
Straws, 327.
Studley, Mayor, 385, 391.
Sugar Trust, 156.
Sundberg, B. E., 169.
Sulzer, Representative William, 369.
Sun, New York, 28, 29, 81, 84, 162.
Surplus, 250.
Swanson, Governor, 200, 266.
Swollen Fortunes, 14.

Taft Must Speak, 175.
Taft on Government Ownership, 274.
Taft Weakens on Reform, 272.
Taft, William R., 96, 97, 116, 117, 175, 176, 270, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 302, 317, 323, 337, 338, 371, 402, 403.
Talbot A. R., 415.
Tariff Catechism, 260.
Tariff Reform, 66, 216, 217, 218, 230, 273, 294, 371.
Tariff Revision, 30, 32, 279, 280.
Taxation, 10, 11, 12, 13.
That Five Million Fund, 97.
That Tariff Commission, 201.
The Asset Currency Scheme, 340.
The Governor's Speech, 130.
The Greatest Man, 268.
The Independence League, 135.
The Line-up, 278.
The Trustee, 324.
The Turn of the Lane, 278.
Things "Ultimate" and Things "Immediate," 65.
Think of This, 16, 120.
Thread Trust, The, 365.
Threatening Panic, 203.
Times-Dispatch, Richmond, 277.
Times, Dubuque, 32.
Times, New York, 113.
Time for Organization, 364.
Tribune, Chicago, 32, 68, 69, 73, 177, 178.
Tribune, New York, 151, 348.
Trusting the Individual, 276.
Trusting the People, 196.
Tolstoy, Count Leo, 4, 5, 159.
Tom Johnson Triumphant, 346.
Towne, Charles A., 53.

"Ultimately," 270.
Ultimate Ownership, 66.
"Undesirable Citizens," 127.
Union Pacific, 86, 109, 236.
United States Senators, Direct Election of, 146, 147.
Use of Wealth, 305.

Valuation of Railroads, 169.
Van Buren, President Martin, 33.
Veale, Senator, 79.
Views of a Veteran, 407.
Virginia Hint, A, 330.
Virginia vs. Pennsylvania, 304.

Wagner, Rev. Chas., 6.
Walsh, John R., 14, 15, 105, 204.
Wannamaker, John, 350.
Washburn, Senator, 32.
Wars, 172.
Washington County Ry., 168.
Washington, George, 60.
Watterson, Henry, 407.
Watson, Thomas E., 69.
Weaver, Gen. James B., 41.
Webster, John L., 416.
Weekly Newspaper, The, 53.
Welcome Oklahoma, 303.
West, H. L., 369.
What About Missouri? 202.
What is a Democrat? 207.
What They Want, 68.
What Will It Stand For? 218.
Wheeler, General Joseph, 190.
Where Does Mr. Taft Stand? 116.
Whitney, H. M., 74.
Why "Exceedingly Desirable?" 314.
Why LaFollette? 322.
Why Not LaFollette? 96.
Why Not Others? 307.
Why Not Submit It to the People? 311.
Why Not Test Them? 394.

Wickham, Henry T., 329.
Williams, Albert, 165, 166.
Williams, George Fred, 171.
Williams, John Sharp, 319, 397, 401.
Williams, Judge, 297.
Winning by Justice, 233.
Wisconsin, Minnesota & Pacific Ry., 169.
Woodruff, Governor, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131.
Wolfe, Representative, 79.
Word to Democrats, A, 317.
World-Herald, Omaha, 118.
World, New York, 65, 66, 78, 126, 205, 207, 268, 347, 348, 358, 367.